

THE
DUBLIN REVIEW.

APRIL, 1864.

ART. I.—THE “UNION” MOVEMENT.

1. *The Union Review*. Nos. I to VI. London: Hayes. 1863.
2. *The Ecclesiastic*, for December, 1863. London: Masters.
3. *The Church Times*. 1863.

THE history of the Anglican Church since the year 1845, which must be regarded as the date of the first and principal crisis of Tractarianism, presents very various and even conflicting appearances. On the one hand, it is marked by a conspicuous development of some of the features which characterized the later stage of the Tractarian movement. On the other, it is no less plainly distinguished by a decline of that sensitiveness to the importance of dogmatic truth which was never otherwise than a prominent note of the movement throughout the whole course of its earlier career, from the first publication of the Tracts to the conversion of Mr. Newman. We have spoken of these several aspects of Anglicanism in more recent times as somewhat contradictory, but a moment's consideration will show that this apparent opposition is on the surface alone, and that the entire facts of the case admit of being referred to one and the same cause.

The first of the subjects in which the Tractarian school has made such conspicuous advances during the last few years, is the not very important one of external and ritual religion. We cannot attach any great moment to this phase of modern Anglicanism as long as it stands by itself. As the natural expression of a great dogmatic system, the ceremonial side of religion is full of meaning and value. It is the language of dogma, which not only forms the medium of its communication to the people, but reacts upon the Church. Not merely does it express by its splendour the greatness of her sovereignty and the extent of her mission, and reflect, in the minuteness of its provisions, the “curious felicity” and reve-

rential punctiliousness of her loving care for the honour of her Lord, but in its several details it serves to work into the minds and hearts of all her members, through the impressions of a sense proverbially powerful in its influence on the imagination, the reality of those truths which bear so directly upon the spiritual life. Take, for instance, the doctrine of our Lord's Presence in the Blessed Sacrament. How greatly do those rubrical arrangements, which, to the heretic or infidel, present the idea of a merely unmeaning formalism, or of some sentiment still more at variance with reason or piety—how greatly, we say, do these multiplied and imperative provisions contribute towards impressing upon beholders the adorable perfections of Him to whose external honour they all relate! But divest these provisions of their doctrinal meaning, or suppose that such meaning has no counterpart in the faith of the people, and no support in the consistent teaching of the institution in which they are found, and then the impressions of the infidel and heretic represent the true measure of their value. They then no longer form the natural language of a truth, but are the showy semblance of a mere fancy. We are far from imputing any other than good and religious intentions to those Anglicans who practise them; we know, moreover, that they often express the belief of this or that individual; but this is surely no valid reason for introducing them into the public worship of any particular religious communion, unless they represent also the acknowledged and unquestionable faith of that communion. To practise them in public worship before the doctrines which they express are taught by authority, or generally received, is to give a cause of scandal without any corresponding advantage or justifying motive: it is like exhibiting a dance before the deaf, who see the movements, but have no perception of the music to which they are adapted, and so are led to mistake the graceful and well-timed response to a beautiful melody for the senseless and gratuitous gambols of a party of maniacs.

We shall be told that the old Tractarians always laid great stress upon the beauty of Divine worship, and sought to heighten it by engrafting upon the meagre ritual of Anglicanism as much of the Catholic ceremonial as it was capable of receiving. We are not called upon, as Catholics, to take up their defence, though we must think that a material difference of principle exists between the more ancient and more modern view of this whole question. No attempt, as far as we are aware, was ever made by Tractarians of the former school to introduce Roman practices *as such*. The basis of the ceremonial superstructure then attempted was the Anglican rubric

itself; and though we admit that its capacities were stretched to the point of straining, still a principle was then acted upon, which now is not even professed. Hence we are quite sure that many things which now appear to be done without scruple or hesitation, would either never have entered into the head of the most Romanizing of former Tractarians, or have done so only to be at once repudiated: such practices, we mean, as the reservation of the (so-called) Sacrament; the elevation of the bread or of the cup; the use of Catholic vestments, and other extravagances of the same character. We think, for instance, that the following description of an Anglican "function," which we extract from the columns of the *Church Times*, presents an idea of the advance of ceremonial religion in the Established Church to which the experience of old-fashioned Tractarians suggests no parallel:—

I was staying a short distance from Aberdeen, and on All Saints' Eve I made inquiries whether there were to be any services, and ascertained that Even-song would be sung at S. Mary's Mission Chapel at 8.15 p.m. With some difficulty I found my way there. The first appearance of the chapel was not very pleasing, as it had the usual barn-like appearance of places where Dissenters love to congregate (once a week). It was, I believe, formerly a Baptist conventicle, and was bought by the Mission for temporary use until they could build a church. A glance, however, at the east end convinced me that I was in a Catholic place of worship. A correctly shaped altar vested for a festival, cloth of gold frontal, white lace super-frontal; on super-altar a jewelled cross, with two sacramental candles (un-lighted), vases of flowers, and four large many-branched candlesticks with lights burning, a crimson dossal cloth, a painting hung on it of the Blessed Virgin and Holy Child. I arrived at eight, and from that to a quarter past the chapel gradually filled, the congregation composed almost entirely of the middle and poorer classes; and I never, in all my life, though I have travelled over the world, saw a more apparently devout congregation. I noticed with great pleasure that every one made a lowly obeisance to the altar on entering, and that the primitive custom of making the sign of the Cross is here retained, though it has unhappily fallen into such disuse in England. The priests and choir entered in procession, chanting the hymn for All Saints—"Spouse of Christ!"—two silk banners with the crosses of S. Andrew and S. George on them, and a processional cross with two lighted tapers, were borne by the acolytes. The officiating priest wore a splendid cope of cloth of gold, with the sacred monogram embroidered in crimson on the back of it. There were no stalls or reading-desks in the chapel, but the whole office was sung by the priests and clerks standing before the altar, which, I can assure you, had a very Catholic and devotional effect. Before and after the Magnificat, the proper antiphon (?) was sung, and during the Magnificat the altar was incensed. After the service, the Rev. G. Akers gave an extempore sermon from the altar-steps on the Communion of Saints.

On the following morning I was present at matins, and high celebration

of the Holy Communion. The Scotch office was used, and certainly, in my humble opinion, contrasts most favourably with the Anglican. After the consecration, the deacon incensed the altar. The chapel was crowded, and the behaviour of the congregation was most gratifying for a Catholic to behold. They all joined most heartily in the Psalms and responses, and from the consecration to the Gloria in Excelsis every one remained on their knees. The whole congregation remained throughout until the last benediction.

I have never seen a choir so well trained, both as to singing and as to behaviour, especially those who served the credence. The celebrant was vested in alb (stole crossed) and chasuble with a large cross on the back of it. The deacon and sub-deacons in albs, stoles, and tippets (?); the lay clerks and choir-men in cottas and tippets; the acolytes in short muslin cottas, reaching to the waist. Of course every one wore cassocks; the priests carried berrettas in their hands, the two sacramental candles and the two standards on the altar-steps were the only ones lighted.

Even-song was similarly conducted to the preceding evening. The chapel was densely crowded—many Presbyterians were present, I think—but all behaved very well. I have no hesitation in saying that at no church in London are the congregation more attentive and devout, or the services conducted with greater reverence than at this little mission chapel, in the midst of heretics and schismatics. Mr. Lee gave an extempore sermon in the evening, which was full of most Catholic doctrine. I believe it is the rule of this little chapel to give extempore sermons, and there can be no doubt that they fix people's attention far more than read ones, and are especially suited to missions.

I had many conversations while at Aberdeen with Presbyterians, in different ranks of life, and it is evident that the bold and uncompromising way in which Church doctrines have been set forth at S. Mary's and S. John's has had a great effect on them. Of course it has excited the Protestant ire of many, but I am happy to say that I saw signs to show that it had also set many a thinking as to what the ordination of Presbyterian ministers was worth. There is no doubt but that the minds of honest thinking Presbyterians in these parts are much shaken (I do not include those who have an interest in the present state of things), and I sincerely believe that the opening of the new church of S. Mary's, of which I hope to give you an account in another letter, will be, under God, the beginning of the end of Protestantism in Aberdeen, providing always that the services and the preachings are carried on in a bold, Catholic, and uncompromising way.*

The strange imitation of Catholic worship exemplified in the preceding extract, has in some places been practised to an extent which might not inconceivably impose upon our poor where ill instructed, or even satisfy them where weak in faith. We have, indeed, a high idea of their Catholic instincts, and look to these, under the blessing of God, to protect them from

* *Church Times*, November 14th, 1863.

such a delusion. The use of the vernacular, also, is a further security for those, at least, who can distinguish the words. Still, we could imagine the case of a poor Catholic stationed, for once in a way, at the end of a long church, who, recognizing the well-known notes of our music, and dimly seeing in the distant sanctuary the forms of clergy flitting about in albs and chasubles, might almost arrive at persuading himself that he was assisting at a veritable Mass. Such an illusion would be rendered at once more probable and more dangerous when the moment came for the so-called consecration, at which, if we are not misinformed, it is now the practice, in some of the Tractarian churches, to *elevate* bread of precisely the same form as that which is employed by ourselves. We are far from wishing to impute to any Anglicans of this advanced school the sinfulness of encouraging such a delusion; but the bare possibility of it is sufficient to put Catholics on their guard.

Here then is one critical difference which seems to us to exist between the views of ceremonial religion maintained and acted upon by former and later Tractarians. There is another still more important, viz., that the former always made doctrine keep pace with its ritual exhibition, whereas the latter seem to think far more of displaying the outward beauty of the Church than of establishing her verities and principles in the hearts of the people. We do not say that they keep doctrine altogether in the background; the very extract we have just given, as far as it goes, implies the contrary. Still it must be borne in mind that the movement has now lost Mr. Newman and others, who were continually building up at head-quarters that fabric of dogmatic truth which it was the object elsewhere to adorn and popularize. This, the disciples of the modern school will say, is no fault of theirs. Certainly not; but it behoves them to think well whether it be not a significant proof that the work in which they are so zealously engaged is essentially hollow and perishable. It is not so much that Mr. Newman and his coadjutors in the work of dogmatic teaching have departed, as that their place has now for many years been left vacant, and that there is no appearance of its being ever again supplied. The want of learners is a no less serious defect in a Catholic point of view than the want of teachers; for the "*Ecclesia discens*" is the correlative to the "*Ecclesia docens*." Nor does it make any difference to the condition of an efficient Church, though it makes a great deal in point of personal responsibility, whether the teachers are withdrawn into a "corner" by their own insensibility to the claims of their office, or by the want of dutiful hearers to listen to them.

Now we own that we observe no great zeal for dogmatic truth in the present aspect of Anglicanism, and the defect is rendered all the more serious and significant by the frightful development of error within, as well as without, the borders of the Established Church. With the exception of Mr. Shirley and a few others, we are not aware of any Protestant writers who strenuously contend for the importance of dogmatic teaching in the abstract; while of works designed to illustrate the dogmas of Christianity, even so far only as they are admitted into the range of ordinary Anglican belief, there has, as far as we know, been an absolute dearth since the days of John Henry Newman.* A great development of ceremonial religion under the deplorable circumstances just mentioned seems to us a plain case of beginning at the wrong end. Ceremonies, where there is no basis of authoritative and consistent teaching, constitute rather the mockery of death than the evidence and expression of energetic life. Gold without royalty, and incense without a sacrifice, are surely rather the mementos of what is wanting than the illustrations of what is present. Nor can we think that, so long as such outward representations of Catholic realities are not accompanied by some general and public recognition of those realities, they will ever avail, to impress them, to any saving purpose, on the minds of beholders. How can such religious exhibitions as that described in the above extract be looked upon as anything else than the results of individual eccentricity, or the characteristics of an exceptional theory, so long as they are in marked contradiction to the prevailing spirit of the system in which they are found; to the language of its authorities, the decisions of its tribunals, and the general belief of its members? Yet, the more feeble is felt to be the grasp of dogmatic truth, the more eagerly do the followers of the modern school seem to preserve these empty shadows of it, and almost to find in them some kind of compensation for the lamentable want of the reality. These writers sometimes talk as if to get Catholic vestments into extensive use were a most important step in the direction of true religion; as if heresy would lose half its evil if it lost all its vulgarity; as if the soul-destroying tenet of justification by faith only, as taught by Luther, and extensively received by clergymen of the Establishment, would

* The works of the lamented Rev. R. I. Wilberforce would form an exception, had not his conversion, which speedily followed their publication, so materially qualified their force as a testimony to the Anglican cause. Nay, may we not even say that it is an exception which proves the rule? Certain it is that this really dogmatic thinker found no home for himself among the later and more advanced Tractarians.

form no serious bar to the union of parties, if only some prominent Evangelical could be prevailed upon to intone the service or come out in a magnificent cope.

We gather, however, from an examination of the periodicals which are named at the head of our article, that there are serious differences of opinion amongst the highest Churchmen of the present day with regard to the importance of these ceremonial displays; and, if we be correct in our estimate of them, and of the light in which their advocates regard them, we may find reason to rejoice that it is so.

These differences, indeed, go some way below the surface, and relate in their foundation to the national character itself. To one party the English mind appears to be cold, phlegmatic, and unimaginative; while the other regards it as impulsive, affectionate, and impressionable. Starting from these opposite points of view, the one considers that a sober, intellectual, and inornate form of worship, like that of the morning and evening service in the Anglican Prayer-book, is better suited to the national character than one which addresses itself more immediately to the imagination and to the heart. The other takes the opposite view, and accordingly prefers, as a way of gaining the people to religion, a service more akin to our own.* We suspect that the truth lies midway between these opposite opinions. The English character has been so seriously injured by the influence of Protestantism, that many of its original and most interesting features are either lost or overlaid. Protestantism has ground down that character to its own level; and its present exhibition is almost wholly devoid of that more sunny light which the Catholic religion would throw over it. We quite agree with the *Union Review* that such a service as that of the morning and evening prayer is fitted neither to elevate nor to interest the great body of our poorer population; but we much doubt whether the substitute which it proposes is more likely to have that effect. Whatever else Englishmen may or may not be, they have an instinctive dislike of everything hollow and unreal. The Mass of the Catholic Church they can understand, though they may dislike it, and the morning and evening service, which they certainly dislike, they understand still better; but a compromise between the two, which has neither the severe simplicity of the one, nor the time-honoured sanction and world-wide prestige of the other, they may be led for a time to attend from motives of curiosity, but they will never yield their homage to it, as the earthly manifestation of their Redeemer's love. They will be

* *Union Review*, November, 1863, p. 600.

shrewd enough to suspect that all this shyness and reserve about giving things their proper names betokens some consciousness of a flaw, or some mistrust of position. "The Mass," and again, "Morning and Evening Prayer," are terms which have a certain downright, English tone about them; but "celebration" is too long a word for popular use; the "daily offering" sounds fastidious and sentimental; "Even-song" is not much better; and as to "Matins" and "Vespers," the services to which those names are given, considering their very prosaic elements, can never be made Catholic by receiving Catholic names. Yet have they undoubtedly a beauty and a value of their own. They have before now ministered to the comfort and edification of many a humble soul; and, for ourselves, if we were to make a choice between the two, as happily we are not obliged to do, we should certainly take part with the less ambitious divines of the *Ecclesiastic* against the more soaring spirits of the *Union*. Whatever may be the defect of old-fashioned Anglicanism, it had a certain character and genius of its own; and although its type were far from the highest, it was yet an essentially unworldly type; and, as such, it ought never to be scorned by those who are in possession of the sovereign truth. It is all very well to be smart upon clergymen who persevere day after day in reading public prayers to two or three old women; but we own that we have not sufficient sympathy with the busy and material temper of the day to feel otherwise than a respect, bordering on reverence, for those who, whether as the teachers or the learners in this despised school of self-discipline, yield so impressive, yet so unostentatious, a witness against that temper. Indeed, with all our natural and cordial interest in the more Roman views of the party of *Union*, we cannot but feel that they are making the old mistake of endeavouring to put an active and effervescing element into vessels of unseasoned material and inelastic capacity, which, instead of preserving that element, will burst in pieces under its pressure. There is no use in trying to force things above their proper level, and we are firmly satisfied that England will never be cajoled into Catholicism by beautiful music, gorgeous vestments, and unmeaning ceremonies.

It is, therefore, with real satisfaction that we turn to a side of the picture upon which we are able to look with more hope: we allude to the increased and still increasing appreciation of the practice of auricular confession; to the study, so far as it exists, of Catholic ascetical treatises; and to the value attached to those good works which imply the spirit of retirement and self-sacrifice in such as undertake them. Among

the various features of the later High Church movement, we consider this as by far the most satisfactory—"sic itur ad astra." It is by the growth of such a spirit that the most certain, because the most substantial, foundation will be laid for the true Church, in whatever way, or at whatever period, it shall please our Lord to bring back her more conspicuous exercise and manifestation of power in this poor country. Our own impression very strongly is, that the various houses of charity which seem to be springing up on every side among our neighbours, will never become in themselves the *nuclei* of Catholic communities, but that their effect will be to educate souls in those principles which can never find their true scope for action except in the Church of God; and we are encouraged in this conviction by the fact that so many of their devoted inmates have already found their way to their true home. That even more do not follow this good example is, we have reason to fear, not so much the result of their own confidence in their present position as of the pressure which is brought to bear upon them. There are sad stories abroad of souls struggling with Divine grace, but kept in thralldom by the mandate of unauthorized and incompetent direction. That these stories may be either untrue or exaggerated, we hope much more for the sake of the confessors than for that of the penitents; since, on true Catholic principles, it is far less to be deplored that any number of souls which are formally right with God should be detained for a season in merely material error, than that those who have the care of their salvation should, upon a theory which has nothing to recommend it, either in the precedents of antiquity or in the voice of the existing Church, make themselves responsible for the repression of conscientious impulses, which, according both to the one and to the other, are the echoes of the voice of God summoning them to a more intimate union with Himself.

It is a fact not a little curious that, after all the undoubted advances which Anglican churchmanship has made since the days of the elder Tractarians, the view of the duty of entering the communion of the Catholic Church which is imposed on individuals by the pleadings of Divine grace, appears to be far less distinctly marked out in the theory, so to call it, of the modern school, than in that from which the followers of that school rather boastfully profess to have emancipated themselves.* Twenty years ago, even those who did not see their own way to quit the Anglican communion, were yet very fearful

* See several expressions to this effect in an article entitled "Visions of Hope," in the July number of the *Union Review*.

of putting difficulties, beyond a certain point, in the course of those who could not conquer their convictions of the duty of doing so, especially where such persons had endeavoured to learn the will of God through prayer and mortification. But a theory is now received, among some few members at least of that section of the Established Church in which the sympathy with Rome is most pronounced, the effect of which is to reconcile unsettled minds to their position, and in some cases, as we fear, to stifle the emotions of an awakened conscience by suggesting that the road to true peace lies in one direction when it may turn out too late to have lain only in another.

We shall devote the remainder of this article to the examination of the theory which the *Union Review* is employed in unfolding; and we will follow the example of some previous writers by throwing the argument with the partisans of "union" into the form of a colloquy, in which we shall endeavour to represent as fairly as possible the opinions which they have put forth in their principal publications. The advantage of this course will be that it will enable us to compress the argument, and to bring the two sides into more immediate and graphic juxtaposition than would be possible in a more discursive treatment of the question. Without further apology, we shall suppose the controversy to assume the form of the following dialogue:—

Catholic. You profess to believe all Catholic doctrine, even down to the latest decision of the Holy See. You do not object, as far as I know, to any approved Catholic devotion or practice. Why then do you not submit to the Church?

Unionist. Simply because I do not think that I am really external to it. Surely you do not maintain that visible union with the Roman Pontiff is necessary to salvation. You admit, for instance, that there is such a thing as being attached to the soul of the Church without belonging to its body.

C. Certainly; but that supposes invincible ignorance of the truth, which is the last thing you would wish me to impute to you.

U. I was using a mere *argumentum ad hominem*; I did not mean to say that my ground of confidence in my position was so low as this; I place it much higher.

C. Explain it then.

U. I consider that I am in the Church, because I belong to one of the three great visible sections of it, though I fully admit the immense disadvantage we labour under in not being externally united with the Roman See.

C. You do not, then, consider your severance from Rome to be a fatal flaw in your position, but only a drawback upon it?

U. That is just my view.

C. Explain, then, how it is that you think it damaging only, and not fatal.

U. I consider that, to use your own phraseology, we have all which is necessary to the integrity of a Church, though not all which belongs to its plenitude and perfection. We have uninterrupted Apostolic descent, valid Orders, and therefore valid Sacraments. Our Church has never formally committed herself to any heresy; though I fully admit, as I said at the beginning, that your Church has many great gifts and privileges which we want. But I am not going to break communion with the Church from which I have received so many inestimable blessings, in order merely to put myself into communion with a Church which, however superior to our own in the advantages which it offers towards the cultivation of the spiritual life, is but one with ours in all which is absolutely necessary to the work of salvation.

C. Your reply contains so much which I regard as questionable, that I hardly know where to begin with my objections. Even were I to grant, which I am as far as possible from doing, that the only or greatest boon which the Catholic Church had to offer you is the power of making high advances in the spiritual life, I think that even then you would be bound to come over to us. For, upon your own theory, you would be only passing from one part of the Church to another; and, though I admit this to be a serious step, yet I can see no objection to it which is at all commensurate with the advantage you admit that you would gain from it. But, of course, I consider that the obligation under which you lie to submit to the Catholic Church, is one of a still more imperative kind. You are resting under an idea of your position, which, even if it were correct in an historical point of view, you know to be rejected practically by both those other sections of the Church, as you call them, with which you conceive that you are in some way really united. You know that neither Rome nor Greece admits the validity of your orders, although they do admit the orders of each other. You know, too, that even were your orders valid, you could not exercise those functions of them which relate to the mystical body of the faithful, without "jurisdiction;" and you cannot blind yourself to the fact that the only jurisdiction which you enjoy is derived from the State, and not from the Church. As to what you say about your communion never having formally committed itself to heresy, upon this question I will speak hereafter.

U. I am not insensible to the difficulties of which you remind me; but I look forward with confidence to the great

Church of the West reconsidering her unhappy policy in respect of our orders and other sacraments, and taking her Anglican sister once more into her friendship and under her powerful protection.

C. But I must ask what you have to say to the position of your Church in the meantime, and upon what grounds you build your hopes of a corporate reunion.

U. I consider the presumption in favour of our view so strong that God will either, in His own good time, make it as plain as noonday; or, at all events, allow for the error, if such it be. Meanwhile, the advantages of such a corporate reunion over individual submission are so great and obvious, that I think it would be madness to defeat the one course by embracing the other. It would be so glorious to see the great English Church reunited to her ancient sister by a stroke of the Pope's pen, instead of waiting for a merely imperfect result through a long course of individual submissions; to witness the restoration of Catholic worship in those majestic cathedrals, which are so far worthier of it than most of the miserable chapels into which you are compelled to contract it; to influence the vast mind of England by means of an intellectual power which never can be brought to bear upon it till our forces are combined; to——

C. Stop, stop, my dear sir; are you not missing the point of our argument? We are surely far better judges upon a question of individual duty than upon the designs of God and the events of the future. Do you mean to say that God cannot, if He so please, bring these results—supposing them to be all as important as you think—out of some other course than that which you propose; or that we are to allow a magnificent vision of the future, which is out of our control, to blind our conscience to that which is His more ordinary way of dealing with His people, the pleading of His Spirit with individual souls?

U. But the indications of His will are too plain to be misunderstood. There are yearnings after Catholic union on our own side which are all but audible. Our Church, too, during the last twenty years has put forth the blossoms of promise with unmistakable force. Yours, I grant, has also made a great start during the same period. I admit, too, that in your practical development, as well as in your abstract theory, you display many advantages over us. I think also, on the other hand, that we have practical advantages over you; and I look upon a corporate reunion as God's appointed method of perfecting His Church by supplementing the

defects, and bringing out the excellences, of the two systems.

C. I fear you will think me very stupid or very prejudiced : but really I cannot appreciate the signs of life to which you constantly refer.

U. What! do you see nothing in the revived powers of Convocation, in the spread and organization of the colonial Church, in the daily celebration, and in the sisterhoods?

C. As to your "daily celebration," even apart from other difficulties, its value is entirely destroyed by your occasional language about clerical celibacy. I confess I do not think your Convocation amounts to much; and as to your colonial bishops, I admit that they are generally better than their brethren nearer home—half, at least, of whom are deeply steeped in the poison of Lutheranism, to the deadly nature of which you all seem to me anything but sensitive. And though you constantly boast of your superiority to the old Tractarians, in this point, at least, you are lamentably behind them. Your colonial bishops are open, though in a less degree, to the same charge; for even the best of them, though they may not themselves teach that pestilential heresy, have no objection to fraternize with those who do, in a manner which proves that they either do not know what religious truth is, or, at any rate, are prepared to sacrifice it to expediency. Under these circumstances, the increase of your episcopate, whether at home or abroad, amounts to nothing more than the multiplication of centres, either of active heresy, or of latitudinarian indifference. I will not press you with the case of Dr. Colenso, which is an extreme one, and my argument is complete without it. Once for all, you are doing little or nothing for the cause of dogmatic theology, while heresy and infidelity are assuming the most frightful proportions.

U. But we look to you to meet this evil. Our line is "subjectivity."*

* It is not a little remarkable that a Protestant writer (see DUBLIN REVIEW for January, 1864; article, "Tourists and Sight-seers in Rome") attributes an undue "subjectivity" to Catholics. The opposite view is maintained in the article in the *Union Review*, on "Visions of Hope;" but with equally little foundation. This writer, with others of his class, seems to forget the provision made for "subjective" religion in Catholic meditation, in the spiritual exercises, &c. He also cites, amusingly enough, the Catholic "grace before meals," as "objective," because it asks for a blessing on the food, instead of expressing the gratitude of the partakers; as if this latter sentiment did not form the subject of the Catholic grace *after* meals: "Agimus tibi gratias," &c. The Collects again, and Post-communion prayers in the Missal, are especially *subjective*; and that at Benediction asks that "we may

C. It is not so much the absence of active efforts in this direction to which I refer, as the general insensibility to their importance. For my own part, I think that such a work as Dr. Newman's "*S. Athanasius*" was a more important step towards real union than all your instances put together. For why is it that your bishops allow you to have your own way in so many points in which their predecessors opposed the primitive Tractarians? Is it from any special love of convents or ceremonies? Or is it not rather from a general insensibility to the importance of doctrinal diversities, and a spirit of latitude which is as favourable to the extremes of error as to the scintillations of truth?

U. I fear this is only too obvious; still, there is a better spirit than this even among the bishops.

C. Well, but the question is, which way the mind of England is going; and this can only be gathered from the tone of our popular literature. I confess that I cannot feel any great satisfaction in the disposition, which may now be observed, to speak more favourably of Catholics and their religion, because it is evidently a part of the liberalism of the day; and I have no wish to see the truth defended upon infidel principles.

U. But if England could be once more united to Rome, we should have the best of all possible safeguards against the growth of this spirit.

C. I grant it fully; but this result will never be brought about except by what seems to me of all events the most improbable—an act of submission on a large scale; and therefore it is that I look for it, if at all, in the course of years through the multiplication of individual conversions.

U. You do not, then, it appears, consider that the corporate union which we are labouring to bring about, would be the best mode of effecting the restoration of England to the Roman communion?

C. I certainly see nothing to desire in a reunion which would imply no humiliation, and no transformation of our national character, but be based upon that principle of English independence which is not more opposed to the proper relations of a Church with the centre of unity, than it is at variance with the genius of Christianity itself. It is the tendency of individual conversions, as you yourselves have truly observed, to correct this spirit; and this is one among

feel in ourselves the fruit of Redemption." In short, the Church, here as elsewhere, compasses in her teaching and practical system *every* end of the spiritual nature.

other reasons why I regard such conversions as God's appointed way of bringing about the result for which we all so anxiously pray. But I own to you that your hopes of a "corporate reunion" seem to me chimerical to the extent of simple absurdity. Your communion, as a communion, is entirely destitute of any dogmatic basis. It is corrupted by heresy from head to foot, and has no power to throw off the disease. This brings me, in fact, to a searching and critical question, which really lies at the root of the whole matter, and to other immeasurably more important conclusions than any on which we have hitherto touched.

U. What can you possibly mean?

C. I will tell you. Do you, or do you not, hold that at this moment you belong to Christ's Visible Church? If you do not so hold, I need hardly say that, on your own principles, you remain under one protracted mortal sin, until you resolve, by Divine grace, to take instant measures for submitting to that Church.

U. Your conclusion is of course undeniable; but you surely know that I regard myself as a member of the Visible Church.

C. You hold this opinion firmly and confidently, and so do all who act with you?

U. We do so, and it is the very basis of our united action.

C. Here, then, is the dilemma in which you are involved by your own admission. It is a fixed and unquestionable doctrine of the Catholic Church, that those who, like yourself, are not under obedience to the Roman Pontiff, are external to the Visible Church.* You cannot, therefore, by possibility, either singly or collectively, enter into communion with the Holy See until you are prepared to believe, with the certainty of Divine faith, a doctrine which your whole party now confidently rejects as false. So long as you believe that you can appertain to the Visible Church without submission to the Roman Pontiff, he cannot, by possibility, consistently with what all Catholics hold to be the law of God, receive you into his communion. But so soon as you cease to believe this your characteristic heresy, you are *ipso facto* strictly obliged, and that under penalty of eternal condemnation, to make your individual submission at once. Ponder, I beseech you, this simple alternative, and then be prepared either to show the fallacy of my argument, or at once to abandon your whole agitation, which you must admit to be, by hypothesis, unprincipled and immoral.

* See, *e. g.*, the extract given in our January Number (p. 90) from the Bull "Auctorem fidei."

U. I confess that this dilemma had not previously occurred to me. No doubt, however, a little thought will enable me to give you a satisfactory answer.

C. In order, then, that you may more clearly understand my meaning, I will express in another form what is substantially the same argument. I am far from wishing to accuse you and your friends of insincerity; I take for granted, therefore, that in agitating for what you call "Catholic union," you are agitating for the establishment in men's belief of some stable bond or principle of union.

U. Assuredly we are.

C. And yet I am unable even to guess what *is* that bond or principle. Our principle of union, as you well know, is our firm faith, grounded on God's revelation, that all Christians are by Christ's law spiritually subject to the Pope. But it cannot be this belief which you are labouring to establish, else you would be labouring to establish the belief that your whole body of fellow-labourers are living in violation of God's solemn command, and in a state of open schism. What is your principle of Catholic union, I cannot imagine; but it is most certainly contradictory to that which all we Catholics believe, with Divine faith, to have been established by God. Your whole agitation, therefore, so far from really acting in our direction, is violently adverse to our most fundamental principle; it tends—or rather would tend, if it had any intrinsic force—to overthrow that which is the corner-stone of our whole organization.

U. But, at least, you cannot object to join our association of prayer for the unity of Christendom. You can pray for unity in your sense, and we in ours; and Almighty God will surely answer our prayers, not according to your view or to mine, but as He shall see best for the interests of His Church.

C. I will cheerfully pray, as I do, that you may all be guided into the truth. But it will be impossible for me to join your association without committing myself, at least by implication, to the opinion that your party is really promoting Catholic union; whereas, as I have just said, you are directly opposing it, and seeking to substitute some anti-Catholic counterfeit in its place.

U. I must say that, considering the reverence and affection we have expressed for so many parts of the Catholic system, your assumption towards us of this attitude of indifference, or rather aversion, places you out of all harmony with the true spirit and the best precedents of your own Church.

C. It is very important that you should clearly understand us on this head. It has happened, at more than one period,

that various persons external to the Church's visible pale have recognized much in her doctrine and discipline which seemed to indicate a Divine presence, and have been thus greatly drawn towards a belief in her fundamental doctrine, that she is Christ's One Catholic Church. And yet these same persons have been, for a longer or shorter period, prevented from submitting to her authority; partly from the force of argumentative objections to which as yet they can see no sufficient answer, and partly from various vague and indefinite misgivings, which have retarded the full and hearty recognition of all her claims. I hope, and indeed believe, that there are several such persons at this moment among the Tractarians; and I fully admit that every good Catholic should view with the warmest sympathy and tenderness their sincere struggles for truth, and should do everything in his power towards removing misconceptions and smoothing difficulties. But I see nothing in common between you and such men as these. They are beset with difficulties and perplexities; you are self-confident, peremptory, and self-complacent. They are approaching by feeble and unsteady steps towards the Catholic doctrine of unity; you are promoting an active and busy agitation in direct opposition to that doctrine. Every step you take along your present road does but remove you farther from the possibility of genuine Catholic sympathy.

Such is our view of the general principles involved in this "union" project; we will next refer to one or two particular characteristics by which the movement is marked. None of these is more prominent than the "nationalism" which pervades it, and by this word we mean to express, not a provision for national *peculiarities*, but a concession to the national *spirit*. We may illustrate this distinction between a national peculiarity and the national spirit in the case of our own country. The English are naturally disinclined to what are called scholastic subtleties. They take broad, common-sense views of a subject, and are disposed to regard minute and verbal distinctions as puerile in their nature, and intolerable when forced upon them as the conditions of accepting any great truth. This is the characteristic which has its good as well as its bad side. It is probably not unconnected with some of the better features of our national character, though we do not believe that it has any necessary relation to them. On the other hand, it is a feature of the English character which, as a fact, peculiarly unfits it for the reception of the Catholic Faith. But a still worse obstacle to the reception of the Faith is to be found in the national *spirit*, which England

shares, not *qua* England, but *qua* nation, with all other peoples on the face of the earth. This spirit inclines her to resist all foreign influence as presumptuous, intrusive, and impertinent; and thus the same sense of national dignity which leads the English people to reject, and rightly to reject, the dictation of France or America in matters political, leads them to dislike what they deem the interference of Rome with their religious liberties. Now our great quarrel with the Unionists turns upon this point. Instead of contending with all their might against a spirit so uncatholic, so detestable, where religion is concerned, they not only show themselves tolerant of it, but even seem to approve and extol it. They consider that one of the chief advantages of corporate reunion over individual conversion is that it gives a certain play to this national spirit: they even deprecate, in language which we hoped had seen its day, the subjection of England to what they call a "foreign yoke," and betray a similar habit of mind in various parts of their writings.

It is therefore beyond question, that one feature of these Unionist doctrines—and that not a subordinate but a very prominent feature—is such as not only *falls short of Catholic excellence*, but directly *contradicts the most important and fundamental of Catholic principles*—those of humility and submission.*

We must next comment on a most extraordinary statement put forth by a writer in the *Union Review*.† This statement is that Dr. Newman and Dr. Pusey are "more agreed upon first principles than any other set of men in either communion." This is as much as to say that a Catholic and a non-Catholic are in fact more united upon matters of faith and questions of ecclesiastical policy than are the same Catholic and the vast majority of his own brethren—as severe an imputation certainly as could be made against any Catholic. The best way of dealing with this extravagant statement will be to consider what are the points upon which all good Catholics necessarily differ from all sincere non-Catholics; and unless this writer be prepared to exclude Dr. Newman from the one class, or Dr. Pusey from the other, we challenge him to dispute the conclusion to which our argument must lead him.

* A most significant contrast is expressed in the *Union Review* (Sept., 1863, p. 477), between the English Catholic body, which the writer is pleased to call "an alien mission *subject* to Rome," and "a National Church in *communion* with her." Here it is more than implied—it is all but openly stated—that these writers are desiring a communion with Rome which shall not involve subjection to her authority.

† July, 1863.

Every good Catholic, then, by the force of the term, accepts the whole body of defined Roman doctrine, not merely as truth, but as the highest truth and the exclusive truth. He believes that whatever the Church has ruled, whether in faith or morals, is certainly and infallibly true; and that whatever in either department she has condemned, is certainly and infallibly false. For all the formal decisions of the Church, whether for truth or against error, come before him with the force of a Divine authority; and the guarantee of this Divine authority is the perpetual presence of the Roman Pontiff, the visible representative of Christ on earth. Hence the true Catholic regards all who are external to the Church in communion with the Roman Pontiff as external to the visible Church of Christ, whatever allowance may be made for individuals under this disadvantage on the ground of inculpable ignorance. On this cardinal question every Catholic in the world differs from every non-Catholic, no matter whether such non-Catholic understand by the Church the invisible body of the elect; or any particular national Church not under obedience to Rome; or Churches united together by a common participation in the privilege, or supposed privilege, of Apostolic descent.

Instead, therefore, of accepting religious truth on the authority of the Church of which the Roman Pontiff is the visible head, every non-Catholic, as such, actually receives it upon entirely different grounds; and instead of believing himself to belong to the Church because he is in communion with the Roman Pontiff, he regards this essential condition of Church membership as not actually necessary to it, however he may look upon such condition as a desirable object of attainment. Now, to say that these differences between Catholics and non-Catholics admit of any comparison with those which may conceivably exist in the Catholic body itself, is surely to betray the grossest ignorance of the real question at issue. Catholics may, and do, indefinitely differ among themselves on matters of opinion and practice which are not regulated by the authoritative voice of the Church; they have their various schools of theology on questions which are not closed by her dogmatic definitions; they may differ largely upon the interpretation of her spirit and intention, within the same limits; nay, they may differ on the abstract and unpractical question, whether a dogmatic definition emanating from the Pope be certainly infallible, apart from the consent, at least tacit, of the general Episcopate. But, differing as they may on such points as these, they are one and all agreed in that which all non-Catholics deny—that the only true Church upon earth is

the Church in communion with the Pope, and that whatever that Church proposes to their belief, must be held as certainly and infallibly true.

In setting forth the advantage of a "corporate union" over individual submission, these writers lay great stress upon the "mutual gain" which the Church and its Anglican converts would severally receive. This view is implied everywhere, but it is formally drawn out in the article entitled "Visions of Hope." The gain, indeed, on the side of the converts is evident enough; but we must absolutely deny that the Church has anything essential to gain from *them*. We say this, as we hope, without either a disparagement of their merits, or an undue exaltation of our own. The Church is, of course, in a certain sense a gainer by every fresh accession to her ranks; and many of our recent converts have brought to her aid advantages which her position in this country prevents her from commanding: such, for instance, as that of a university education. But the Unionists mean much more than this. They evidently suppose that the Church, at least in England, is disfigured by serious blots, or labours under damaging defects, and that *they* are the people to reform her. It is against this notion that we must emphatically protest. The Church, thank God! in England, as elsewhere, possesses the pure Gospel; and this gift renders her perfectly *αὐράκιος*. Converts, whether they come to her as individuals or as a body, have all to gain from her, and nothing but themselves to give. Much of that which these writers appear to desiderate in the Church she already enjoys: much which they propose to impart to her would be an evil rather than a good; and nothing of what is essential to her spirit or conducive to her true influence is beyond the reach of her inherent capacity, or external to the stock of her native resources. She can well afford to dispense with gains so equivocal and boons so treacherous, as those habits and tempers of Englishmen which belong to a national character always too impatient of the central authority, and confirmed in its notions of independence by three centuries of Protestantism. She has ample provision in the precepts of the Gospel for all which is really noble in English manliness, or really gentle in English gentlemanliness, without either the pride of the one, or the exclusiveness and fastidiousness of the other. She has, as we have already shown, a machinery of ascetic theology as fully adequate to the needs of the individual soul, as her dogmatic system is powerful to secure it against the dangers of an unhealthy self-introspection: and thus in every department of necessary

truth she is, in the true sense of the term, abundantly "self-sufficient."

With the view, apparently, of preparing its friends for what they must expect should they pass over to our ranks, the *Union* in one of its recent numbers has exhibited a picture of the condition, proceedings, and opinions of English Catholics.* The author of this curious production seems to have felt the disadvantages under which he laboured in the execution of his task, and, judging from the results, we cannot think that he has overrated them. We do not deny, indeed, that his picture possesses a certain outline of truth just sufficient to blind his readers to a considerable amount of error in detail. In one respect he is a little unfair upon us. He says that the reserve and reticence which Catholics practise with regard to what goes on among them, form a serious obstacle in the way of such a narrative as his own. We, on the contrary, are inclined to think that it might have been better if a little more reserve had been maintained, though it is somewhat ungrateful in a writer who has evidently availed himself of his opportunities with some success, to complain of the silence of those whose confidential openness he has somewhat largely abused. The paper reads like the composition of one who has been admitted into Catholic society, and gone into it with his ears open, but who has mixed with it only in that occasional and superficial way which has enabled him to pick up scraps of truth, without being able fully to test their bearing upon the questions in which he is interested. Like the great circumnavigator, he may be said to have gone round the world without going into it. Hence, as we have said, together with some truth his statement contains a good deal of error. It is not true, for instance, that the Oratory is the only church in London in which the services of female singers are replaced by trained choir-boys. Neither is it true that there is no church in London in which the annual amount of the offertory exceeds £100, for we are well acquainted with one, by no means the largest, in which it greatly exceeds that sum. To say, again, that the church music of Farm Street is an imitation of the opera is so conspicuously untrue, that one wonders how the writer's regard for his own credit for veracity did not keep him from stating what is so palpably open to contradiction. But when a writer is not strictly accurate as to facts, we may well expect to find that he falls into serious errors in his attempts to interpret opinions. Our critic, however, nothing daunted, professes to be con-

* *Union Review* for September, 1863, p. 437.

versant, not only with the acts, but with the innermost thoughts of English Catholics. He is *au fait* of the counsels of the Cardinal. He knows the conditions upon which the Redemptorists absolve their penitents.* Of all the secrets of the Church, none certainly are kept more religiously, with the single exception of such as fall under the *sigillum*, than those which relate to the proceedings of ecclesiastical bodies, such as chapters, or the corporation of bishops. They are matters upon which Catholics in general neither possess information nor exercise curiosity. But this critic has here the advantage of us. He has every reason to believe that the Bishop of Birmingham is not merely opposed to Cardinal Wiseman, but the leader of an episcopal opposition to His Eminence! We should consider it to be as unbecoming to refute this statement as to make it; for the subject is wholly beside our province. Neither is refutation necessary, for it is implied in the statement itself. The Catholic bishops of any particular country have two spheres of action: their own dioceses in which they are supreme, and the provincial synod in which their individuality is merged in their corporate action. Those of England meet, indeed, once a year in London to consider the affairs of the Church in a less formal way than when they meet at more distant intervals in synod; but in all their synodical, or quasi-synodical assemblies, their decisions are arrived at by the votes of the majority, and are carried into effect by the united co-operation of the whole body. Thus their differences of opinion on practical questions can never by possibility interfere with the integrity of their corporate action. Those differences never travel beyond the assembly in which they may be expressed while questions are under discussion; so that unless the Union Reviewer were hidden in some invisible corner of the chapel or library at Oscott during the debates of their lordships at their last provincial synod—or, which is quite as unlikely, is in the intimate confidence of some one among them—he must excuse us if we absolutely refuse all credence to his statements or surmises as to the opinions of the English episcopate one way or the other, excepting so far as those opinions are manifested in public documents or acts.

But we have another quarrel with this gossiping critic; and one of a more serious nature. The rules of literary etiquette, unless we are mistaken, do not allow of liberties with the names of those who are not, in some true sense of the term, public characters; more especially when such liberties imply

* *Union Review* for September, 1863, p. 445.

disparagement or censure. No doubt, some of the persons alluded to by our critic come fairly within the class of exceptions. But we know not by what right he selects as the objects of a kind of judicial sentence, in which praise and blame are balanced with a sort of affected impartiality, such quiet and unobtrusive men as Bishop Morris, Dr. Maguire, Father Eyre, and others. Bishop Morris is "a good-natured old gentleman of about seventy, who affects the style of eloquence of fifty years ago." Dr. Maguire is "a representative of the Gallican school; a well-read and kind-hearted, but not very popular man;" and so on. We wonder what would be said if Catholics were to attempt a similar picture of Anglican "schools and parties;" one, we mean, not founded upon the patent facts of their literature or public exhibition, but upon the unguarded speeches of some garrulous member of their communion, or upon second-hand information, coloured by its passage through a partial medium;—if they were to relate the reported differences among leading men; the weaknesses of this clergyman, or the waywardness of that "reverend mother;" or if they were to show up the defects in the choir of one church, or expose practices in the confessional of another. For our own parts, we should consider such a procedure as in the highest degree presumptuous and impertinent.

There is one matter in which we observe a considerable degree of ignorance on the part of our Anglican critics, though we must add in fairness that the paper we have just noticed displays far better information respecting it than other writings of the same class. We allude to the notion that there is a strong line of demarcation in opinion as well as in position between converts and hereditary Catholics. That converts, *as such*, are looked upon with suspicion and mistrust by the great body of their fellow Catholics; or that, through the effects of any such feeling on the part of their ecclesiastical superiors, they have been excluded from posts of dignity and responsibility, is an idea, which, speaking generally, we have no hesitation in pronouncing as completely mistaken. The writer of the article on the state of schools and parties among us, has made an observation on this subject which is intimately connected with the confidence manifested, on the whole, towards converts by their elders in the faith. He has referred, in terms strikingly similar to those in which the same fact was lately noticed in this very REVIEW,* to the remarkable absence of what may be called a convert party. United, as they are,

* See DUBLIN REVIEW (New Series), No. I., Art. "Essays and Miscellaneous Papers."

among themselves in loyalty to the Church, and the desire of doing her such service as may be permitted them, the converts retain many of their original distinctions of character, and differ amicably in matters of subordinate moment. To this circumstance it is mainly owing that they have amalgamated naturally and easily with the great Catholic body, to an extent of which no one can be aware who does not live in the very heart of our society. The two classes are intimately mixed up in effective co-operation and in social intercourse. They act together on committees; they take a joint part in public meetings; they entertain, to all appearance, that mutual respect for each other which is founded on the consciousness that each possesses—as the effects of their several antecedents—practical qualities which are mutually supplemental and corrective of one another; and we can truly say on behalf of the converts, that *their* gain in the compact is far from being the least considerable. No answer to the prevalent supposition of a misunderstanding between the two classes of Catholics can be more complete than that which is furnished by the example of the Oratory, where, more perhaps than in any other representative body of converts, a line has been always taken in very remarkable contrast to many of the traditions of the English Catholic body; nor can any fact be more honourable to both sides than that a common desire to promote the glory of God and the salvation of souls should have so completely outweighed the effects of characteristic differences, or the natural bias of hereditary prejudices.* Again, when we look into the Catholic Directory, we find no reason for thinking that the claims of converts have been overlooked in the distribution of ecclesiastical dignities, or in the appointment to posts of importance and responsibility. The English Chamberlain of the Pope, who is understood to enjoy in no small measure the esteem and confidence of the Holy Father, is a convert. Monsignore Manning, a convert also, is a Roman prelate of the highest class, and Provost of Westminster. The heads of the English College at Rome, and of S. Mary's, Oscott, are both of them converts. So was the late Abbot of

* In the article to which we have lately referred, the name of Dr. Maguire is mentioned as that of one who has come into active collision with some of the converts. We may take this opportunity of saying that there is no member of the ancient Catholic body who has manifested a more invariably generous interest towards converts than that most learned, candid, and excellent priest; and that they are keenly alive to the fact. The description of Dr. Maguire as a "not very popular man" is one more proof of this writer's incompetence as a witness in the cause he has volunteered to undertake.

Mount S. Bernard's; and so are the superiors of both the Oratorian houses in England, of the Oblates of S. Charles, and of the Redemptorists. The Chapters of Westminster and Birmingham each contain two converts on their list of canons, besides the provost of the former. Several important churches and missions have been entrusted to converts. The Secretary of the Poor School Committee is a convert; the Diocesan Inspectors of Westminster and Southwark are also converts; and so have been both the last and present Principals of the Training College at Hammersmith.

But whatever may be the faults of the paper lately in question, they are almost converted into merits when it is contrasted with another article which appears in the same number, on the Life of Bishop Milner. A more unpleasant production in point of sentiment and tone than this critique has not often come before us. We cannot but regard it as an ill-disguised attempt to pin the writer's view of the existing body of English Catholics upon a subject which has no obvious connection with it. The whole spirit of Bishop Milner's movement was as dissimilar as is possible to that in which the present partisans of union with Rome are engaged. His efforts were directed to the vindication of the rights of the Church against the encroachments of English nationality. Theirs is a work of a completely opposite character; and we really can see no reason why Bishop Milner should be selected as the object of their eulogy in preference to those of his contemporaries with whom he was at variance, unless it be that of introducing a venerable name as a passport for opinions which its owner is only not able to repudiate because he has been long removed from this world of strife and imperfection.

But there is also another reason which gives to the times of Dr. Milner a peculiar interest in this writer's eye. They were times of contention among Catholic bishops, as well as between those bishops and the laity, which seem to him to suggest a telling counterpart to the dissensions which have so often agitated and rent his own communion; as if there were any parallel between disputes upon matters of policy among those who were entirely in accord upon the great doctrines of religion, and controversies affecting the very foundations of the faith. The attempt, again, to separate off Bishop Milner from the more devoted adherents of Rome, and to assimilate him to the members of the Anglican communion, because he happens on his death-bed to have professed his trust in the merits of Christ, shows a depth of ignorance on the elementary principles of Catholic practice and direction which deprives the writer's judgment of any kind of weight on the whole matter

of which he treats. The description, also, of Bishop Poynter as a "singularly unamiable person," is in the highest degree unjust and untrue, as many Catholics now alive, who had the pleasure of being intimately acquainted with that virtuous and estimable prelate, can fully bear witness. But we should have been willing to set down such lapses or such exaggerations to the account of imperfect information, or unconquerable prejudice, did not this writer in other places manifest a spirit which we cannot acquit of sectarian virulence of no ordinary intensity. There are passages in his article which would befit (so far) the pages of the *Saturday Review* much better than those of a periodical which professes a definite religious character, and aims at narrowing and not at widening the gulf which separates us Catholics from our Protestant fellow-countrymen. Take, for example, the following precious specimen of malevolent ignorance:—

If we look from the clergy to the people, we find scanty successes as the natural results of such an artificial system. A wealthy convert occasionally, a good sprinkling of dowager duchesses, here and there an Anglican clergyman, young, nervous, and impressible, who, having called on an old friend at the Oratory or Bayswater, is politely invited to "see the Father," and with equal politeness accepts the invitation; a one-sided discussion ensues, in which the young clergyman gets the worst of it; he stays to sleep, and goes away next day in full communion with Rome very happy. There is plenty of activity in the making of converts, but less zeal, we fear, in the care of the flock.*

Two statements are here made, or implied, both of which are as untrue as they are ungenerous. The first is, that those who have entered the Church since 1845 are chiefly persons of the higher classes. This impression may have arisen from the practice of recording the names of the more distinguished converts in the public newspapers; but it is inexcusable in the *Union Review* to give circulation to it, inasmuch as a writer in the very same number is at pains to expose the error. The great majority of the conversions annually made in London and elsewhere, are from the middle and poorer ranks. This writer seems to forget that there are many Catholic missions in London which do not rejoice in dowager duchesses; yet in all these missions persons from the classes which most abound in their neighbourhoods are constantly presenting themselves to the clergy for instruction, and that, too, without the very least solicitation or pressure. Even an Anglican publication bears testimony on this point. In a published address

* *Union Review* for September, 1863, p. 476.

of the Rev. Dr. Littledale, reported in the *Church Times* of Dec. 12, 1863, that gentleman says, "There is no Roman Catholic mission in London so thriving as that in Islington." Yet the prosperity of that mission, whatever it be, is certainly not owing to "dowager duchesses," or other wealthy converts, but to Catholics, most of them converts, of an entirely different class. The second and far worse insinuation is, that our clergy neglect their own flocks in their zeal to make converts. We appeal to any one capable of bearing witness on the subject, whether there be any Catholic churches in London in which the Catholics of older standing are more cared for than those in which the largest number of conversions is made. The same sentiments are expressed still more offensively in the sequel:—

The old "chapel" is pulled down to give place to a "church." The bishop comes to consecrate, Dr. Manning to preach; and there is great talk of the increased number of the faithful—but it is chiefly talk. *In the towns, if we except the resident foreign population, Irish, and others, and the duchesses, and other converts above-named, necessarily few—very few—with these exceptions, the congregations are largely composed of Protestants, who go in to stare at the candles, to smell the incense, and go away wondering how rational people can call that RELIGION.* The strongest condemnation of the system lies in its palpable unreality; while the glory of the elder school of Roman Catholics was that they were simple, honest, and real. *Which Englishmen are likely to prefer, the reader will easily judge for himself.**

Unfortunately for this argument, the appeal to Englishmen has been responded to in a sense the directly opposite. Not only have churches, missions, orders, confraternities, and all else which bespeaks the vigorous life of the Church, been multiplied beyond all precedent under the development of religion which he pronounces hollow and unreal, but the congregations of which the nucleus previously existed now number their members by hundreds where they formerly numbered them by tens. We happen to know of one church where the attendance on Sundays has literally increased in this very proportion; and we are persuaded that it is not a singular instance. If Protestants form a certain proportion of these numbers, the question is, why they come, as they do, so repeatedly, and generally behave with the greatest decorum, unless it be that they find in Catholic worship some attractive power which they miss in their own. Should this writer's opinion be correct, that they come merely to "stare at the candles," "smell the incense," "and wonder how rational

* *Union Review* for September, 1863, p. 476

people can call that *religion*," we confess that we should regard the conversion of the English nation as still more improbable than we do; though it is not to our purpose, as it is to this writer's, to argue in favour of such an eventuality. We scarcely need remark on the palpable inconsistency of such language in the mouth of a member of a party, which, if it be distinguished by one thing more than another, is notorious for the importance it attaches to the adoption of the striking externals of Catholic worship; but this is only one among a thousand every-day instances of the way in which those who profess Catholic principles are driven by the necessity of their position to employ the vulgarest Protestant allegations in their opposition to the Church. We believe, however, that the fact is as we have said, and that no inconsiderable number of the Protestants who frequent our churches, are led to them because they find that Catholic worship appeals to the latent and better instincts of the human heart. They find in the orderly conduct of the divine offices, in the solemn and affecting music, in the altar radiant with lights, and dimly discerned through clouds of incense, and in the devotion of our people, something which, little as they understand its full scope and import, raises their thoughts, almost in spite of themselves, above the spirit of that world to which it is all so diametrically opposed.

The article called "Visions of Hope" (July, 1863) is marked as "communicated;" but its writer so warmly sympathizes with the "Union" movement, that his views may reasonably be taken as illustrating its spirit. Now it is remarkable that whatever is said in this paper on the subject of dogma, is said rather in disparagement than in support of the scholastic principle. In one place there even occurs the ominous phrase, "theological subtleties;" a phrase which receives a significant comment from the utter absence of any distinct recognition of theological science in any other part of the same essay. Nor is this the only evidence of the undogmatic *animus* which is to be found in the paper. High Churchmen and Low Churchmen, Tractarians and Evangelicals, Catholics and Dissenters, are all spoken of as if capable of being compounded into a sort of theological pulp, in which the advantages of external union shall be found to counterbalance the want of essential amalgamation among the component elements. Either it is supposed that all the parts of this compound which are not already Catholic will patiently allow their distinctive principles to be merged in those of the Church; or that their effective union will not be prejudiced by the presence of their actual incongruities. The first would be as impracticable as the second is un-

desirable. Yet we fear that our friends on the other side are too little alive to these facts. They do not seem to feel that the Church is not a mere compound of heterogeneous atoms, but an organic whole; that its principle of coherence is from within, and arises from the reception of a certain substance of doctrinal truth; not as a mere condition of membership, but as the form and manifestation of that one Spirit by which the whole body is inhabited and vivified. This Unity of the Spirit is something so essentially different from that sort of gregarious principle which is now leading the members of different countries to meet and co-operate for the purposes of science, art, literature, or what is called social progress, that we are not able to share, even in the slightest degree, the hopes of a religious union which are founded upon the great increase of such international combinations. For it is impossible not to discern in most of these demonstrations of fraternity an utter godlessness, which proves them to be simply of that world whose principles and aims are in diametrical opposition to those of Christ and of His Church.

In regard, then, to the more earnest and sensible members of this party, we would entreat them most affectionately to consider, whether they be not allowing an amiable but perilous delusion to turn them aside from the path of conscientious rectitude. It is precisely by such specious sophistries as that by which they are suffering themselves to be deluded, that the Enemy of souls is apt to stifle the voice of conscience and the inspirations of grace. There are those who, he is well aware, will not be persuaded to listen to his suggestions unless he couch them under the form of duty; and his mode of dealing with such souls is to invest with the majesty of that imposing name the visions of fancy or the dictates of mere human inclination. The conversion even of a single Protestant to the faith is so serious a blow to his power, that it is no wonder he should exert all his malice to prevent it; and if he could but succeed in amusing his victims with some delusive fancy till it was too late for them to escape his toils, he would achieve a perfect masterpiece of infernal policy. Now conversion to the faith is anything but pleasant. It is not pleasant to our rebellious nature to enter the kingdom of heaven as little children. It is not pleasant to take a leap in the dark. Flesh and blood recoil from the sacrifices which even in these days conversion requires; the resignation—in spirit, at least, and in possibility, if not in act—of family and friends, of social position and professional prospects. In robbing conversion of these conditions, we rob it also of its chief merit, and change its character. This is what the Enemy

strives to do. He opens a royal road to the Church, in which we can expatiate freely and take our time, but which will never bring us to the point of our destination. Instead of the self-denying and humiliating act of childlike submission, he proposes a parley and a negotiation, which leave human nature the proud consciousness of giving an equivalent for what it receives. For a solitary and arduous pilgrimage he substitutes an agreeable journey in company with like-minded friends; and by suggesting the hope of united action and public movement, dignifies with a respectability most attractive to Englishmen what now wears in their eyes the appearance of an exceptionable step and a conceited crotchet.

Meanwhile it behoves the advocates of corporate union to turn their eyes from visions of hope to practical questions of great and pressing importance. It is quite certain that if they are not heretics, they are schismatics—and formal schismatics. If, that is, they be prepared to accept all Catholic doctrine (including that of the supremacy of the Pope), they are not justified in withholding, even for a single hour, their submission to the Catholic Church. The only plea for their hesitation would be found in their unwillingness to receive the whole cycle of Catholic doctrine; in which case, of course, whatever may be said in their excuse, the same difficulty which prevents their entering the Church as individuals, is equally opposed to their entering it as a body; since it is infallibly certain that not one iota of that doctrine will ever be relaxed to meet their objections. They must absolutely choose between the horns of this dilemma, and either is fatal to their theory. If they have not emancipated themselves from heretical error, they are in no condition to plead for union; and if they have, their project of future corporate reconciliation will never serve them as a justification of their present individual schism. One plea alone will rescue them from the threatened consequences of separation from the visible Body of Christ—the plea of invincible ignorance: and this is a plea from which we must say, in all friendliness, that by their acts and writings they are doing their very best to debar themselves. Still we would hope, in spite of the proofs which they seem so anxious to exhibit to the contrary, that this plea may yet avail them, seeing that it is founded, not merely in intellectual ignorance of the Truth, but in an inculpable incapacity of the will for receiving it, which may co-exist even with the amount of light and knowledge they appear to possess. Yet, after all such allowances, the question for their consciences is certainly an anxious one; and, for our own parts, we should be sorry to have such a question pressing on us with a shipwreck at sea

or a railway collision in imminent prospect. Yet this is the sort of criterion by which S. Ignatius would have us try ourselves when great questions of duty are presented to us. The point is, not how we feel about them when sitting in our arm-chairs, or talking over our wine; but what would be the light in which we should regard them when the doctor had given us over, and we had only a few hours or moments left to settle our final accounts with our Judge.

On the whole, we are compelled to say that, in this movement, so far as we may judge of it from the published opinions of its authors and advocates, the evil, both in extent and in magnitude, greatly preponderates over the good. Any indications of dissatisfaction under a state of separation from the Catholic Church, and any manifestations of sympathy with Catholic truth, and of kindness towards Catholics as individuals, we gladly and gratefully acknowledge, and are fully prepared to accept such tokens of an improved feeling and a better wisdom as hopeful omens. But our hopefulness respects the individuals, and in no degree extends to their theory. That theory we regard simply as a delusion, and, so far, not as an aid, but as an obstacle to the fulfilment of those encouraging anticipations which the language of its upholders is often calculated to favour. Our deep distrust of the movement, together with the painful grounds of that distrust, have been sufficiently manifested in the preceding pages; but it may help towards clearness if we bring both the one and the other to a point.

In the first place, we regard the agitation for "corporate union" with simple aversion, because the theory of union on which it is based is utterly at variance with the Catholic principle. But even if this objection could possibly be got over, we should still regard the whole movement with profound distrust, because it is destitute of any clear dogmatic principle; and in the actual state of the Established Church, it could never be made popular, and, by consequence, effective, except by *waiving* that principle as its essential condition; and such is practically the course adopted by its advocates. They talk much of the beauty of fraternal union. They dwell largely upon the æsthetical and sentimental side of religion; upon ceremonies, devotions, brotherhoods, and sisterhoods. But they forget that these and such like excellent things derive their meaning, their healthiness, their congruity, their coherence, from the one fixed and immutable Truth which they represent, and carry out in energetic action. For these theorists well know, or will speedily learn, that multitudes who can talk eloquently of the results, not merely repudiate but abhor that

truth in its Catholic integrity, its unbending strictness, and its rigorous exaction of an absolute, or, as they would express it, slavish surrender of the intellect and of the will.

As this theory is uncatholic, because undogmatic in principle, so is it unchristian in spirit. It seeks to evade those conditions of humility and self-abnegation which our Blessed Lord, in speaking of His kingdom as the inheritance of children and childlike souls, makes absolutely essential to the true character of His disciples. Nationalism is but pride under another name, and pride all the more dangerous because disguised under the specious form of patriotism. Now of this theory of corporate union, it is represented as even a merit that it spares that act of personal humiliation which individual conversion requires; and that it reserves some of those distinctions which belong, not to the original and harmless diversities of national character, but to the spirit of independence which is common to all nations in proportion as they are not disciplined in the school of Christ.

In a work which is thus profoundly anti-Catholic, and is, moreover, tainted by the plague-spot of pride, we can have no confidence, and no wish concerning it but that it may speedily and finally perish. But to its promoters we wish all good; and therefore we wish, in the very first place, that they may be extricated from the trammels of a theory, which, so far from bringing them nearer to the Church, is helping to drift them away from it.

Of those members of the Catholic body who are in the habit of using a Protestant publication as a channel for venting their dissatisfaction with their bishops, we can speak only in terms of indignant reprobation. But there are other Catholics also against whose line of action we must enter our strongest and severest protest: we mean those who have allowed themselves to encourage this movement, whether by expressing sympathy with it, or joining the Association which is as yet its only practical result. For the Anglican friends of the movement we can offer some excuse, on the ground of ignorance or enthusiasm, but its Catholic abettors can avail themselves of neither of these pleas. They are going out of their way to commit an act opposed alike to faith and charity: to faith, because it involves the surrender of the key-stone of Catholic unity, the sovereignty of the Roman Pontiff, and recognizes the false and heretical proposition that Catholic Christendom is, or can be, in a state of chronic disorganization; to charity, because it fosters in those whom we are bound to instruct in the way of salvation, an error whose progress is confusion, and whose end is ruin.

POSTSCRIPT.—The January number of the *Union Review*, which reaches us at the end of our work, contains two letters of correspondents which more than justify our worst misgivings as to the equivocal character of the movement which it is pledged to support. We grieve to add that both of these letters appear to come from Catholics, and that one of them professes to be written by a priest. We should require conclusive proof before we could resign ourselves to the belief that there exists even one priest in England capable of representing one of the highest privileges of his order as "*compulsory* celibacy," or of contemplating, as a possibility, the day when "our authorities" will have to *settle* the question of relaxing the institution so described, as a part of ecclesiastical discipline. We need not dwell on the absurdity of applying the word "compulsory" to a state of life voluntarily chosen, after full deliberation, by persons thoroughly cognisant of its nature and obligations. But we will not believe, till the proof is forced upon us, that any one educated in a Catholic seminary could speak with such revolting coolness of a revolution in the Church's fundamental discipline, which would be regarded, we will not say merely by ecclesiastics, but by the general body of laymen, with unspeakable horror and disgust.

"Presbyter Catholicus" is followed in the same page by "Lancastriensis," who informs us that "our authorities" have taken offence at the criticisms of the *Union Review* upon the state of parties among ourselves, "because they dislike any public allusion to the differences of opinion, or policy, which prevail among us. For myself," he adds, "I cannot agree in that line of action which would stifle all differences on matters immaterial by the iron hand of a despotic authority." Pleasant "visions of hope" these, for quiet and well-disposed Catholics! What are the facts? A gossiping scribe in a magazine drags unobtrusive characters before the public, criticises their actions, interprets their intentions, pries into their secrets. Moreover, he takes unwarrantable liberties with high dignitaries, professes to know their preferences, and sets them against one another upon no evidence but that of the shallowest suspicion, or the vaguest rumour. The authorities in question are naturally displeased, and complain. And this, forsooth, is "to stifle differences on matters immaterial by the iron hand of a despotic authority."

But then "Lancastriensis" is "impressed by the accuracy of [this writer's] information." If reiterated assurance be a guarantee of testimony, then is he indeed a credible witness. "There is not a fact nor statement from beginning to end which I should not be prepared to adopt." Not satisfied even

with this ample corroboration, he still goes on:—"Nothing could be more accurate than your statements."

Now, considering that "*Lancastriensis*" belongs to Lancashire, and that the statements in question relate almost exclusively to the diocese of Westminster, his extreme certainty, expressed with all the eager positiveness of an eye-witness, and with all the force of tautologic phrase, would seem to indicate an access to sources of knowledge little less than infallible. Whereas we, who happen to be living in the midst of the scenes and society of which the critic in question treats, have already asserted, and here re-assert, and are prepared to corroborate, confirm, and establish by such proofs as no reasonable man will refuse to admit, that—although it is not the accuracy of the writer alluded to which is alone in question, but his delicacy and sense of propriety—his statements are in several respects inaccurate, and his inferences purely gratuitous.

It is only fair to the editor of the *Union Review* to add that, in the last number of that periodical, he makes an apology for the paper on English Catholics, at which some of our authorities are supposed to have taken umbrage. As we are neither the parties aggrieved, nor in any way authorized to represent them, we cannot say how far the editor may appear in their eyes to have made amends for his fault. As our own objection, however, to the paper in question has turned very principally upon its meddlesome garrulity and unfair personalities, which are more or less independent of the truthfulness or untruthfulness of its statements, we cannot say that we are fully satisfied with an explanation which expresses regret for them, not because they are intrusive and personal, but only in so far as they may be untrue.

ART. II.—FATHER MATHEW.

Father Mathew: a Biography. By JOHN FRANCIS MAGUIRE, M.P., Author of "Rome; its Ruler, and its Institutions." 8vo. London: Longman. 1863.

THE record of such a career as that of Father Mathew is, of its own nature, less a biography of the man than an episode in the moral and social history of his age. The influence, almost unexampled in modern days, which he exercised over the minds of his countrymen, is less curious as a study of personal character, than as an illustration of the laws which govern those mysterious, half-spontaneous movements of the public mind, which from time to time unexpectedly arise, and by which the ordinary current of human life seems for a season almost unaccountably interrupted. The so-called philosophical historians of mediæval Europe have expended much speculation on the various episodes of popular enthusiasm which constitute its most curious characteristics; whether those which, like the great movement of the Crusades, arose under the impulse of ecclesiastical authority, and were directed by its influence, or those wild and unregulated outbursts of fanaticism, as of the Flagellants, the Pastoureaux, or the Fraticelli, which either directly originated in hostility to the Church, or, in their progress, discarded her guidance or revolted against her authority. Were it not that events such as these lose much of their picturesque interest when they are seen close at hand, and when, from habitual contact, the mind has become familiarized with their everyday aspect, we can hardly doubt that the "pilgrimage to Cork," the monster assemblages which crowded together in every district of Ireland to meet the "Apostle of Temperance," the complete and unreasoning enthusiasm with which all, without distinction, followed at his call—Catholic and Protestant, rich and poor, the young man strong in the consciousness of virtuous habits and of vigorous health, and the half-palsied sot, physically enervated by excess, and morally prostrated by the memory of a thousand forfeited promises and resolutions flung to the winds,—might afford a subject for study scarcely less attractive, and, in some respects, of even greater practical importance, than the most wonderful among the marvels which form the romance of mediæval history.

The personal history of Father Mathew, therefore, independently of the interest with which, for its own sake, it cannot fail to be regarded by the community to which he was the instrument of one of the highest of earthly benefits, must form an important element in any investigation into the history of the moral and social reformation with which his name is imperishably associated; and we gladly welcome Mr. Maguire's careful and affectionate memoir, as the first contribution to the authentic materials needed for this important inquiry. Our space, however, will not permit of more than an outline of the leading facts of Father Mathew's career, especially in relation to what must ever be regarded as the labour of his life.

The incidents of his early years, although not without a certain interest, the more touching from their very simplicity, need not detain us long. They are not of much importance in themselves, nor can they be said to have given any special promise of the great work which he was destined to accomplish.

Theobald Mathew was born at Thomastown, in the county of Tipperary, October 10th, 1790. His grandfather, John Mathew, of Thurles, was descended from a branch of the Mathews of Thomastown, well known for their munificent hospitality in the social history of Ireland during the eighteenth century. On his death, his orphan son, James Mathew, was adopted by his relative, George, first Earl of Llandaff, and educated at Thomastown House. On his attaining to manhood, James was entrusted with the management of the household and establishment, and continued to reside at Thomastown, even after his marriage with Miss Whyte, of Cappawhyte, which took place about 1784. Theobald, the fourth son of this marriage, was born while his parents still continued to reside in Thomastown; but, a few years later, they removed to a place called Rathcloheen, in the immediate vicinity, where James Mathew settled in the position of a gentleman farmer, and where his family continued to increase until it numbered no fewer than twelve members, nine sons and three daughters. Three of these, a brother and two sisters, still survive.

Theobald, or, as he was familiarly called, Toby, was the "pet" of the family; and his choice of the ecclesiastical profession naturally had the effect of rendering even more tender the affection of his mother, who is described as a lady of much piety, and of great good sense. The immediate charge of his education was undertaken by his relative, Lady Elizabeth Mathew, the only daughter of the earl, who

was several years his senior, and who regarded him from childhood with a sincere affection which endured unaltered to her death. He was educated at Kilkenny, and in his seventeenth year (1807) entered the college of Maynooth. His studies in that college, however, were interrupted in the following years in consequence of an infringement of academical discipline,* to which, although it does not appear to have involved any grave moral culpability, he himself afterwards, in addressing the students on occasion of one of his Temperance missions to the college, alluded in terms of much regret and of very impressive warning. In consequence of this failure he turned his thoughts from the secular to the regular priesthood; and having passed through the Capuchin novitiate, and made his preparatory theological studies, he received the holy order of the priesthood at the hands of the late Archbishop Murray, in 1814.

The first scene of Father Mathew's ministrations, as a Capuchin friar, was Kilkenny; but he was soon transferred to Cork, where his fellow labourer was Father Francis Donovan, regarding whom Mr. Maguire has preserved some interesting particulars. One of the incidents of the foreign career of this ecclesiastic belongs in some sense to general history. Like a large proportion of the Irish ecclesiastics of that period, he had, while pursuing his studies in Paris, become chaplain in the family of a French nobleman. Before the time arrived for his return to Ireland, he was surprised by the rapid progress of the Revolution; and, his patron having been compelled to follow the common course adopted by his order—of emigration, Father Donovan was left in Paris in charge of the family hotel.

But as the guillotine was robbed of the Marquis, the Chaplain was made to take his place. It did not require many minutes, or a long deliberation, to find one of his order guilty of treason against the public safety; and the sentence was a matter of course.

It was a fine, bright sunshiny morning during the Reign of Terror, while yet Marat was a popular idol, and Charlotte Corday was brooding over her thoughts of vengeance away in the quiet province, when a long procession of victims wound its way through the streets of Paris, delighting a populace

* Mr. Maguire is mistaken in stating that the Rev. Dr. Montague was at that time president of the college. The president in 1808 was the Rev. Dr. Byrne, afterwards parish priest of Armagh. Dr. Montague did not become president of the college till 1834. He had previously held for many years the office of vice-president; but even on this office he had not entered at the period in question, his vice-presidentship only dating from 1814.—See Maynooth Report for 1826, p. 445.

still unsatiated with blood. On it went, accompanied by a scoffing and yelling rabble, that surged and swayed against the horse-soldiers who guarded the prisoners, and who struggled to reach the scaffold with unbroken line. In one of the rude tumbrils was the Abbé Donovan, who had been actively employed during the preceding night in administering the consolations of religion to his fellow captives. The goal was at length approached, and the first tumbril was close to the scaffold, on which stood the executioner and his assistants, ready for their dreadful work. Father Donovan, whose appearance was the signal for many a scoff and curse from the savage crowd that were now about to enjoy their daily feast of human slaughter, believed his last moment in this world had arrived; and having whispered a few words of hope and consolation to his companions in misery, he offered up a prayer to God, and prepared to meet his fate with the fortitude of a Christian. But just as he was about to cross the narrow space which appeared to separate him from eternity, an officer, whom Father Donovan ever after described in resplendent colours, rode up to the head of the procession, and raising his voice—"his melodious voice, sir"—above the hoarse murmur of the swaying multitude, cried out—"in the vernacular, sir"—"Are there any Irish among you?" "There are seven of us!" shrieked Father Donovan, in agonized response. "Then have no fear," said the officer, in a voice that sounded to Father Donovan's ears as the voice of an angel; and using his influence with the officials and guards, this man in authority had his seven countrymen put aside, on some pretence or other, and ultimately secured their safety. The guillotine and the friends of "liberty, equality, and fraternity," were so fully fed on that day, that both could spare the few prisoners who were rescued from the knife of the one, and the remorseless cruelty of the others.

It was with the hero of this hair-breadth escape from the scaffold, now a man advanced in years, that Father Mathew was associated in the charge of the so-called "Little Friary" for several years after his removal to Cork. He soon became distinguished as an earnest and instructive preacher, and still more as a tender and zealous director in the confessional. There is little, however, in the incidents of this part of his career to distinguish it from the common record of the life of any good Irish priest whose ministry lies among the poor of a populous city or town. But there is one picture which, however it may resemble in its main outlines scenes with which the terrible visitations of cholera in 1832 and in 1849 rendered our clergy but too painfully familiar, is drawn with so much truthfulness of detail, and so much graphic force, as to deserve special commemoration. It is an incident of Father Mathew's experiences in the cholera hospital in 1832;—

He had administered the last rites of religion to a young man, in whom he had a special interest, and having received a summons to another part of the hospital, he hurriedly quitted the ward, from which he was absent but for a short time. On his return, he approached the bed in which he had left the

young man alive ; but the bed was now unoccupied. "Nurse, nurse ! what has become of the young man who lay in this bed ?" asked Father Mathew. "Dead, sir," was the laconic answer. "Dead !—it cannot be—where is he ?" "The corpse is taken to the dead-house, sir." "I can't believe he is dead—I must go myself and see," said Father Mathew ; and he at once proceeded to the ghastly chamber to which the dead were borne, previous to being taken out for interment. It presented an awful spectacle, indeed. At one end was a pile of miserable coffins, the merest shells, made of thin boards, and knocked together with a few nails. Some of these wretched receptacles were on the floor, either with their lids fastened down, or open and awaiting their future occupants. On tables, and also on the floor, lay a number of bodies, in each of which a heart throbbed and a soul dwelt a few hours before. Some lay, blue and distorted, in the sheet in which they had been snatched from the bed on which they died ; more were wrapped, like mummies, in similar sheets, which had been covered with pitch or tar, liberally laid on to prevent contagion. Amidst that scene of death in its most appalling aspect, there was a horrid bustle of life : coffins being nailed down with noisy clatter—sheets being rapidly covered over with a black and seething substance—bodies being moved from place to place, and tumbled into their last receptacle with the haste and the indifference which a terrible familiarity with death engenders in the minds of a certain class—orders hoarsely given—figures moving or reeling to and fro ; for it was necessary that those who performed the horrid and revolting duties of that chamber should be well plied with whisky : it was the custom of the time and the necessity of the moment. Into this scene of horrors, partly lighted by a few coarse, flickering candles, Father Mathew hurriedly entered. Even the strongest might have recoiled at the spectacle which met his sight ; but he only thought of the object of his mission. There lay the body, and near it were two men preparing the tarred sheet in which they were to wrap it. "Stop, stop !" said Father Mathew, "surely the young man can't be dead !" "Dead, your reverence ! God forbid you or me would be as dead as that poor fellow—the Lord have mercy on his soul !" said one of the men. "No, no, I can't believe it—I was speaking to him a moment before I left the ward—let me try." "Wisha, try, if you plaze, your reverence ; but he's as dead as a door-nail ; and shure it doesn't take long to carry a man off in those times—God be between us and harm !" There was a momentary suspension of the loathsome work, as Father Mathew knelt down beside the body, and pressed his hand lightly over the region of the heart. A group, such as few, save perhaps those who loved to paint the terrible and the hideous, would desire to see near them, clustered round the devoted priest ; and not a sound was heard for a time in that chamber of death. There was a suspense of a moment—it seemed an age—when Father Mathew cried out exultingly—"Thank God ! he is alive !—I feel his heart beat—thank God, thank God !" It was quite true—life was not extinct ; and restoratives having been applied, the young man was removed to another part of the hospital—and in a few days after he was able to pour forth his gratitude to him who, through God's mercy, had rescued him from inevitable death ; for had but another minute elapsed, he was lost to this world for ever. As may be supposed,

this incident had a salutary effect in the hospital, though it was little wanted to render as untiring as ever the sleepless vigilance of Father Mathew.

The earnest benevolence which this striking narrative places in so strong a light was the special characteristic which won for Father Mathew that enthusiastic admiration and love to which he owed much of his success in the great movement of his later life. In every scheme of practical charity, in every effort for the education of youth or the amelioration of the condition of the poor, undertaken whether by public or by private benevolence in Cork, he was invariably found, if not as a leader, at least as a hearty co-operator. And yet, deeply as he felt the evils of intemperance, and earnestly as he laboured both in the pulpit and by private exhortation to withdraw the people from the seductive influences which, in Irish society, at that time beset its unhappy victims, he long hesitated as to the practicability of any successful organization for its extirpation. Numberless efforts had been made, as well by individuals as by associations: but the success had been slender and precarious; and, almost by common consent, a certain licence, as regards this fatal but insidious habit, had come to be recognised as a characteristic of the Irish temperament. It was not that the absolute consumption of ardent spirits in Ireland, compared with the population, was greater than in the other portions of the empire. It actually fell short of the Scottish in the proportion of 13 to 22; and although it very much exceeded that of England, yet the excess in the consumption of spirits in Ireland was probably much more than counterbalanced by the large English consumption of malt liquor, which in Ireland was comparatively little consumed. Nevertheless there had been something in the tone of Irish society, low as well as high, which had established for this habit of intemperance a most formidable standing-ground. It had come to be regarded as a mark of good fellowship; and although, when carried to a grievous excess, it did not fail to entail a forfeiture of character and position, yet its minor degrees were indulgently regarded, and even the most extreme abandonment was a subject far more of pity than of reprobation. Within certain limits it might almost seem, among the humbler classes, to have been a necessary element of popular favour. At fairs, markets, and meetings for popular amusement, unconvivial habits were held almost to bespeak the churl; and cases are well known to have occurred in which a tipsy gait and bearing were actually simulated, in order to escape the imputation of a niggard or unmanly spirit.

From a combination of many causes the consumption of

ardent spirits in Ireland had reached its maximum in 1838, in which year 12,000,000 gallons had been distilled. All the ordinary expedients for the reformation of the drunkard had proved ineffective. The efforts of the clergy in the confessional, from the very nature of the case, could only reach a certain class, leaving almost entirely untouched the very cases which most needed reformation; and even in those cases where success was obtained, it was commonly but partial and precarious. Resolutions, promises, even oaths, proved but feeble bonds. Most ingenious evasions were devised in order to get rid of the obligation, too soon found irksome and insupportable; and pages might be filled with a record of the amusing expedients by which it was sought to observe the letter of the engagement at the expense of the spirit. One man's promise "never to put glass to his lips" was evaded by employing the hand of a friend for the purpose. Another, who had sworn "never to drink a drop on Irish ground," relieved his conscience by mounting a few steps of a ladder. A promise "never to taste liquor inside of a house or outside of a house" was held to be literally fulfilled by standing, while in the act of drinking, neither inside nor outside, but scrupulously upon the threshold! The still more ordinary promise, "not to taste a single glass," was met by using a tea-cup or a wooden beaker; and the not unfrequent limitation to a single glass led to the use of a glass of such abnormal capacity as to satisfy even the most liberal toper. These are but a few of many similar devices by which the promise of abstinence was evaded; and it is painful to add that in the great majority of cases there was no attempt to justify or to conceal the too manifest violation.

In those times, indeed, there was but little chance of the reformation of a drunkard, however remorsefully conscious of the guilt and ruin which the vice of drunkenness involves. By the very effort to reform through the observance of abstinence, he became a marked man. The unusual practice drew all eyes upon him, and marked him out as one who was conscious of his own incapacity for self-restraint. If he attempted to pursue it at his own table, he laid himself open to the further charge of inhospitality, and perhaps of grudging illiberality. Imputations such as these, when directed against individuals, told with terrible effect, and there needed no ordinary degree of moral courage to stand against them.

And in truth these were the great impediments with which it was necessary to deal, as a preliminary to a reformation of the intemperate habits which prevailed in Ireland. It was necessary first to throw a shield over the repentant drunkard,

by taking away the stigma from his only real safeguard, total abstinence. It was necessary, secondly, to dissociate the same practice from the imputation of churlishness and illiberality, and to show, by unquestionable examples, that it was possible to be open-handed and generous without squandering money upon intoxicating drinks. It was necessary, in a word, to make total abstinence *morally and socially respectable*.

To attain these ends, the obvious expedient was to establish an association, embracing in a large proportion members whose position and character might raise them above all suspicion of such imputations, whether moral or social, as those to which we have above alluded. And, in point of fact, many such associations had been originated or projected. But not one had found the key to the confidence, much less had stirred the enthusiasm, of the people. The "Temperance" Associations, most of which merely required abstinence from distilled, but permitted the use of fermented liquors, were believed to be designed to spare wine, the luxury of the rich, while they struck at whisky, the beverage of the poor; and were felt not to be, in Ireland at least, the poor man's associations. The "Total Abstinence" Societies, on the other hand, were in many instances regarded only as shams. And almost all the schemes of the time, whatever their object, had for the people one fatal taint—that they originated with the known enemies of their creed, and carried with them the suspicion of some covert fraud or hostility. Many of the most ardent promoters of total abstinence were also the most prominent leaders of the May Meetings in the Rotunda; and, but a few years before Father Mathew entered upon his career, one of the most active missionaries of the temperance cause was a northern clergyman, who had earned for himself a very questionable notoriety by relating circumstantially at a Bible meeting, as an evidence of the prevalence of superstition in Ireland, the story of a priest having recently exorcised a supposed demoniac, by expelling the devil from him in the shape of a huge black eel!

It was hard to expect that the Catholic clergy would co-operate cordially with such leaders, or that the Catholic people would listen reverently to their counsels. Nevertheless, many priests in their respective districts were exerting their influence to promote total abstinence, and many benevolent individuals of every class were labouring to find some neutral ground upon which all might work together for so great a moral good. Among these was a worthy Quaker of the city of Cork, named William Martin, who had long exerted himself in his own sphere with little fruit, but who, with a full conviction that

the elements of success, which he felt to be wanting in himself, were united in the highest degree in the humble Capuchin friar, had repeatedly urged Father Mathew to join in the work. "O Theobald Mathew," would the honest Quaker appeal to him, "if *thou* wouldst only give thy aid to the cause, what good *thou* wouldst do for these poor creatures!"

Father Mathew, deterred doubtless by considerations such as we have suggested, long hesitated. But he was decided at last; and having once taken his resolve, he threw himself into the cause with all the ardour of his temperament, and with all the generous devotedness of his benevolent and Christian heart. He took it up as the work of God. With the true Catholic instinct, he saw that the only road to permanent success lay through the religious sympathies of the people; and the whole key to his later career may be found in the homely but hearty words in which, at a meeting in his own school-room, at Cork, on the 10th of April, 1838, he proclaimed his final determination. "*Here goes,*" he exclaimed, as he took up his pen to sign his name first in the book which afterwards became the Register of his Association—"Here goes, in the name of God!" In these simple words spoke out the spirit of the man—his energy, his Christian courage, his kindly human feeling, his thorough appreciation of the popular sympathies, above all, his genuine piety and humble trustfulness in God. In these familiar but pregnant words, or rather in the manly Christian heart which prompted them, lay hidden the germ of those marvellous successes which they inaugurated.

From the modest roll of sixty, which formed the total of Father Mathew's Society on this its first evening, the number swelled in three months to 25,000, in five months to 131,000, and in less than nine months to 156,000. In the January of 1839 it had risen to 200,000, a large proportion of whom were from the city and county of Cork, with contributions, however, from the adjoining counties of Kerry, Waterford, Limerick, Clare, and Tipperary. By this time the enthusiasm had begun to extend itself more widely.

The tidings of the great moral reformation worked in Cork quickly spread, through the agency of the public press, throughout the island, and to all parts of the United Kingdom. The speeches of Father Mathew and his assistants were copied from one paper into another, and with them accounts of the success of his mission, the benefits which it conferred on the community as well as on the individual, and the evils which it remedied or prevented. Attention was thus arrested and interest excited, and it was only natural that those who read or heard accounts of what was doing in Cork, should come to the conclusion that what was good for Cork was good for other places, and that what had done one person good would do another person good; and so,

as Father Mathew did not come to them, they resolved on coming to him. Thus it was that the public conveyances brought numbers into Cork every day, and that multitudes of pilgrims might be seen on the roads leading into the city, with their little bundles in their hands, and generally lame and footsore after their long journey. To Cove Street the pilgrimage was directed. To see Father Mathew—to take the pledge from him—to be touched by him and blessed by him—this was sufficient reward for the longest and most painful journey.

To this period of Father Mathew's life may be traced the first origin of the pecuniary embarrassments by which its close was clouded.

Never did Father Mathew send the poor pilgrim from his door without having first fed and comforted him, and, where necessary, provided for his safe and easy return. A seat on a public car, or something in the pocket, enabled the poor traveller from a distance—often of 50 miles, sometimes of 100 miles—to return happy and joyful to his home. Thus, through the accounts given by the early pilgrims of the good man who had heard their story, who had sympathised with them, who had blessed them and prayed for them, who had treated them as a father and a benefactor, was the fame of Father Mathew spread abroad, even more effectually than through the columns of the public press. The expense entailed on Father Mathew by what may be described as this pilgrimage to Cork, the Mecca of temperance, was considerable; and before he ever sold a single medal, he was involved in debt to the amount of £1,500, notwithstanding the numerous offerings which he continued to receive as a priest. His resources were not increased, but his expenditure, even thus early in the movement, was so to a very great extent.

Mr. Maguire gives us an amusing glimpse or two behind the scenes of the great total abstinence drama.

At all hours of the day and evening—even to ten or eleven o'clock at night—"batches" of ten, twenty, or even thirty, might be seen waiting to be enrolled. Some were sober and penitent; others smelling strongly of their recent potations, and ashamed to commit themselves by uttering a word; more, boisterous and rude, their poor mothers endeavouring to soothe and keep them under control. One of this class—a big, brawny fellow, with rough voice, bloodshot eyes, and tattered clothes—would roar out:—"I won't take the pledge—I'll be —— if I do. Is it me! What oc-oc-occasion have I for it? I won't demane myself by taking it. I always stood a trate, and I'll stand it again. Me take it! Let me go, woman! I tell you, lave me go!" "Oh, Patsy, darlin', don't expose yourself. You know I'm for your good. And what would his reverence say to you if he heard you? Do, alana, be quiet, an' wait for the holy priest." "Well, hould off of me, any way. Can't I take care of myself? Can't I do what I like? Who'll dare say I can't." "Oh, Patsy, Patsy, darlin'!" "Is, indeed! Patsy, darlin'! Let me go, woman!"—and, bursting away from the trembling hands of the poor creature, who struggled to hold the drunken fool, Patsy would make

a wild dash to the door, amidst muttered expressions of sympathy, such as, "God help you, honest woman! 'tis you're to be pitied with that quare man." "Yes," another would remark, "an' a fine man he is, and a decent man, too, if he'd only be sober." But just as Patsy was about effecting his escape, and swearing that "he would never be the one of his name to demane himself by taking their dirty pledge," he was certain to be arrested by Father Mathew himself, who at a glance knew the nature of the case. Catching Patsy with a grasp stronger than that from which he had escaped, Father Mathew would say, in a cheerful voice to Patsy, as if that gentleman had come of his own free will to implore the pledge at his hands—"Welcome! welcome! my dear. Delighted to see you. Glad you are come to me. You are doing a good day's work for yourself and your family. You will have God's blessing on your head. Poverty is no crime, my dear child; it is sin alone that lowers us in the eyes of God. Kneel down, my dear" (a strong pressure on Patsy's shoulder, under which Patsy reluctantly sinks on his knees), "and repeat the words of the pledge after me; and then I will mark you with the sign of the Cross, and pray God to keep you from temptation." What could poor Patsy do but yield, as that magnetic hand rested affectionately on his tangled locks? And so Patsy's name was added to the long muster-roll of the pledged.

From Cork, as head-quarters, Father Mathew began to make periodical visits to other large centres of population—Limerick, Waterford, Parsonstown, and eventually, in 1840, to Dublin. About this time the pressure of the pecuniary difficulties alluded to above, drove him to the expedient of distributing, at a small fixed price, cards and medals, the profit upon which went to defray the manifold expenses attendant on his mission. This practice furnished at a later period the ground of one of the most frequent charges brought against Father Mathew, to which Mr. Maguire devotes a chapter full of curious details, and establishing beyond the possibility of cavil the entire disinterestedness of this noble and self-sacrificing man.

It was at this time also that the belief of his being invested with miraculous powers obtained its widest circulation. Father Mathew was bitterly reviled as encouraging and practising upon this superstitious belief. We must make a place for his own simple and touching explanation of the conduct which he really pursued in reference to it:—

My dear friends, I wish to allude to a certain subject, to which I adverted on the first day I attended here—it is with regard to the great number of infirm and sick persons that are coming here to take the pledge. I mentioned before what brought them here. They attend to join the society in consequence of the exaggerated accounts they received from those who had been drunkards, and who, to encourage others to become teetotallers, showed the benefit they enjoyed from being temperate in their habits. They state that their health, which had been impaired by the use of intoxicating liquors,

became renewed, and that their constitutions, which were broken down, were repaired by the practice of temperance. The first person I heard speak on the subject was Mr. Smith, the great teetotalter, who stated that persons who for years could not work, when they became teetotalters were able to resume their avocations. This induces people who are suffering from various diseases to come to me, under the impression that I could cure them ; but it is not in my power to afford them relief ; that is all in the hands of God. I received an anonymous letter on the subject, finding fault with my conduct ; but I don't mind those attacks, it is my wish to please and satisfy all. St. Paul said he would himself be an anathema for the sake of his brethren. Some persons say, why not put them away ;—but I would not envy the feelings of the man that could treat these poor people so unkindly. Persons who are free from superstition have brought me to those sick persons, to gratify them ; and when I went to them I did not refuse them my blessing. I went through no ceremony of any kind, but simply invoked a blessing on them, and it is no harm to do that to any thing, animate or inanimate, or to any creature, rational or irrational. Whatever the consequences may be, though I do not wish to see them coming here, I will not refuse them my blessing, or, rather, refuse to ask God to bless them. If, for one moment, I relieve them from pain of mind, or despondency of heart, I care not what is said about it, for it should not give scandal. Several of those persons have been turned out of hospitals incurable ; and it is natural that when man cannot afford them aid, they apply to heaven for it. Persons of strong religious belief have importuned me to give them a blessing and let them go away. I cannot, as I said before, bless them, but I can say, “God bless you.” I use neither candle nor holy water, nor go through any ceremony, but merely give them a blessing. I have seen Protestants invoking a blessing.

Mr. Maguire's volume contains a detailed history of Father Mathew's progress through the most important localities in Ireland, including his visits to the ecclesiastical colleges of Maynooth and Carlow. As our limits preclude the possibility of our entering into these particulars, and as, unhappily, no record has been preserved—or rather, indeed, as no exact record was made of the numbers enrolled in each locality—we must content ourselves with the following interesting extract, exhibiting in a tabular form the successive rates of the diminution in the consumption of ardent spirits in the years which followed the inauguration of the Society :—

The figures which are to be now given, exhibit the marvellous change effected by Father Mathew's preaching in the drinking habits of his countrymen. These figures show the number of gallons of Irish spirits on which duty was paid, and the amount of duty, from the year 1839 to the year 1844, both included :—

Year.	Gallons.	Duty.
1839 . . .	12,296,000 . . .	£1,434,573
1840 . . .	10,815,709 . . .	1,261,812
1841 . . .	7,401,051 . . .	936,126
1842 . . .	6,485,443 . . .	864,725
1843 . . .	5,290,650 . . .	904,908
1844 . . .	5,546,483 . . .	852,418

It has been seen that, even in the year 1842, the consumption of Irish spirits was reduced to one-half of what it had been in the year 1839. And though the Famine, which had its origin in the partial failure of 1845, and was developed into frightful magnitude by the total failure of 1846, produced a baneful effect on the temperance movement, by impairing its organization, closing the temperance rooms, and inducing the people to seek in false excitement a momentary forgetfulness of their misery; still the consumption of spirits did not recover from the effects of Father Mathew's mission, and for years exhibited the result of his influence, as the subjoined returns will show :—

Year.	Gallons.	Duty.
1845 . . .	6,451,137 . . .	£860,151
1846 . . .	7,605,196 . . .	1,014,026
1847 . . .	7,952,076 . . .	1,060,276

The figures which we have quoted exhibit, it is true, most important results; but an extract from the trade article of the *Freeman's Journal*, for February, 1842, will indicate, in an equally striking manner, the happy influence of the temperance movement upon the comforts of the Irish people. The writer says :—

“The people, we have abundant proofs, are happier and better, and the nation is more intelligent and prosperous. Perhaps the best proof which can be given of the former is the increase of the Customs revenue, more particularly as regards those articles which are especially consumed by the people. The increase in the Customs revenue of Great Britain and Ireland during the past year was £148,000, of which the increase of those duties levied in the port of Dublin alone was £77,000, or more than one half of the entire increase. The whole amount of this revenue from this port in the past year was £984,000, or very close upon one million. But the articles from which this large amount of increased revenue has been received are those the humbler classes consume most largely; the increased consumption of *tea and sugar* producing in this port, within that period, an increased revenue of 10 per cent. In the duties on tea and sugar in this port of Dublin alone, the increase amounts to £55,000, or over one-third the whole amount by which those duties in the present exceed those of the past financial year.”

The writer adds that the result would appear more striking were not duty paid in England on much of the sugar used in Ireland. The revenue on tobacco decreased to the amount of £3,000 within the year.

In 1843 he visited England. His success in England lay chiefly among the Irish population; and indeed, on some occasions, especially in London, an attempt, instigated, it was believed, by the vintner interest, was made to enlist the anta-

gonistic elements of the English mob in opposition to him. But even among the English population his success was not inconsiderable, and his influence long continued to be felt in the districts which he visited.

Soon after his return to Ireland, and his resumption of his Irish mission, the pecuniary embarrassments already referred to reached their height; and, while publicly administering the pledge in Dublin, he was arrested at the suit of a medal manufacturer. By the exertions of friends, the crisis was of course averted; and ultimately, having effected large insurances upon his life, he was relieved from the pressure. To the payment of the premiums on the sum thus assured, he was obliged to apply a pension of £300, which at a later period was conferred upon him by the Queen.

On the death of Dr. Murphy, Bishop of Cork, in 1847, the name of Father Mathew was, by a majority among the parish priests, forwarded to Rome as Dr. Murphy's successor in the see of Cork. On full consideration, however, of all the circumstances, and especially, as it was believed, of the embarrassments in which he was hopelessly involved, the recommendation was set aside, and the second named upon the list was appointed as the future bishop.

Although he was seized with paralysis in 1848, the vigour of his constitution enabled him to overcome the effects of the attack so far as to accomplish, in the following year, the visit to America which he had long contemplated. In many respects, however, this visit was unsatisfactory, and even painful. An attempt was made to involve him in controversies upon the slave question, which seriously marred the success of his real mission. Still, he had the happiness in America, as elsewhere, of winning the confidence of his own countrymen; about 600,000 members being added to the roll of his Society in the course of his progress.

This journey, however, most probably hastened the crisis of the disease with which he had before been threatened. Soon after his return, February 1st, 1852, he was struck with apoplexy. The attack again yielded partially to medical treatment, and he soon resumed his ordinary duties. But although his strong spirit refused to yield to the blow, he never again recovered from its effects. A visit to Madeira, in 1854, failed to restore his strength. He lingered till 1856, when, at Queenstown, December 8th, 1856, he died a tranquil and holy death, in the sixty-sixth year of his age, and the forty-second of his priesthood.

His biographer devotes an interesting chapter to the inquiry whether his work survives him. We can only glance

at the results. That numberless defections have taken place, even among those who were formally enrolled in Father Mathew's society, it is impossible to deny. An entirely new generation, too, which knew not Father Mathew, has arisen since his death. Total abstinence is no longer, as in his day, the ideal to which the public moralist aspires; and we look in vain for that religious enthusiasm which, under Father Mathew's guidance, was the very soul of the reformation of which he was the apostle. But it is equally impossible to doubt that a great and radical change has been effected; and that, in this most important department of public and private morals, a new standard has been securely and permanently established. If the marvels of the movement have passed away, its solid, though unobserved fruits unquestionably remain. The "heroic virtue" of total abstinence has in a great measure disappeared, but a steady, if undemonstrative, sobriety has taken its place. Nor do we believe it possible, humanly speaking, that the country should ever again relapse into the condition from which the energy and devotedness of one simple priest was, through God's grace, enabled to arouse it.

In the wise and moderate verdict of Father Mathew's biographer we cordially concur:—

Formerly, drunkenness was regarded rather as a fault for which there were numberless excuses and palliations; now, drunkenness is looked upon as a degrading vice, and the drunkard finds no universal absolution from the judgment of society. Whatever opinion may be held as to the necessity of total abstinence, or the wisdom of moderation, there is but one opinion as to excess—that is, one of just and general condemnation. Formerly, there was not a circumstance in one's life, or an event in one's family, or in the family of one's friend or acquaintance, that was not a legitimate excuse for a poor fellow "having forgotten himself," or "being overtaken by liquor;" but a sterner verdict is now pronounced upon the delinquent—and that sterner verdict, which evidences a higher tone of public wisdom and morality, is another of the results of Father Mathew's teaching. And in this way, too, his work has survived the mortal life of its author.

ART. III.—SLAVERY AND THE WAR IN AMERICA.

1. *L'Abolition de l'Esclavage*. Par AUGUSTIN COCHIN. 2 vols. Paris : Lecoffre.
2. *The Results of Emancipation*. By AUGUSTIN COCHIN. Translated by MARY L. BOOTH. Boston : Walker, Wise, & Co.
3. *The Results of Slavery*. By the same.

THE French work, whose title we have given above, is in every respect remarkable. It is by a man well known in Paris as foremost in all works of Catholic charity, and as having held the high and important office of mayor of one division of that capital till he was deprived of it on political grounds. In France, we need hardly say, such offices are held on the appointment of the sovereign, and during his pleasure. M. Cochin has also distinguished himself in the field of literature. He was one of the most prominent among the French members of the Catholic Congress at Malines last summer. His name, ere he inherited it, had been made illustrious by one of his family, who founded, before the great Revolution, a hospital which has survived that great moral and social deluge, and still affords annual relief to more than 2,000 patients. The work before us has made a great impression in France, and has been crowned by the Academy. In America, also, it is well known. We would most heartily recommend it to Englishmen. It is a remarkable monument of noble talents, patiently and laboriously devoted to advocate the cause of suffering humanity upon the highest Christian principles. The first volume is occupied with an examination of the results of the abolition of slavery—first in the French colonies, then in those of England, Denmark, and Sweden. In every instance, M. Cochin, instead of contenting himself with declamation or general assertions, goes carefully into particulars, and states nothing which is not founded upon minute and careful investigation of original documents.

The first part of the second volume is devoted to the "results of slavery" in the countries in which it still exists; first, in the United States, then in the colonies of Spain and Portugal, in Brazil, and the colonies of Holland. After this comes a chapter on the Slave-trade, and African immigration, and another—one of the most striking of the whole—on the relations of Slavery and Christianity. The appendix to this

volume contains several very interesting documents. We are anxious that Englishmen should be made aware of the impression produced on the minds of intelligent and candid foreigners—nay, of men who, like M. Cochin, must be ranked among the greatest admirers of England—by the state of public feeling with regard to the Free and the Slave States since the outbreak of the present miserable war. We believe that M. Cochin is mistaken in what he implies, that the reason is to be sought in English jealousy of the naval power of the United States; but we cannot deny that the mistake is most natural and excusable.

The second and third books on our list are translations of the two volumes of M. Cochin. We can very strongly recommend these to persons curious in bad translations. They will find much amusement in comparing the wondrous sentences of Mrs. Booth with the same sentences as they stand in the clear, forcible, and eloquent pages of M. Cochin. They are probably not much worse than the mass of the translations which come to us from the same quarter. But as those translations are chiefly reproductions of short works of devotion, the task, from the nature of the subject, presents fewer difficulties, and the effect is, on the whole, less grotesque. However, there is at the end of the first book of the second volume an interesting addition of a few pages, supplied by the author after the publication of the French work. Otherwise, we do not think the translation likely to be of much use, at least in England. In most parts, though by no means in all, a great deal of labour, close attention and thought, will enable a reader, who cannot obtain the original, to form a tolerably fair guess as to the author's meaning; but we can hardly imagine any Englishman who would not find it much easier to read and understand the French of M. Cochin than the "English" of Mrs. Booth.

In discussing the subject which these works bring before us, we are most sincerely anxious not to write a word which can in any degree wound national sensibility. If this were ever excusable, the subject is far too great and too solemn to admit of any but the calmest and most dispassionate treatment. But, in truth, nothing could at all times be more opposed to our feelings and principles. The division of mankind into nations is a law of Providence, the hatreds by which they have become alienated the result of human corruption. They have generally sprung from trifling circumstances. But hardly one among them has failed to deluge the earth with blood, and to entail a miserable legacy of sins and judgments. How different at this hour would have been the condition of England

and France if their people had always cherished brotherly feelings? Unhappily, these miserable antipathies seem to spring up most readily between nations which, without being actually united, have most in common. We see, with deep regret, the degree to which they exist between England and the United States. God forbid that we should say a word to produce or foment them. Unless we deceive ourselves, the feeling is chiefly (we had almost said wholly) on the other side of the Atlantic. There it is strong enough to threaten an incalculable amount of crime and misery. The seeds, we presume, must have been sown in old grievances, long before the separation of the North American colonies. The struggle with the mother country of course excited fresh irritation. But natural good feelings, and common sense, and, much more, Christian principle, unite to pronounce, that from the day on which George III. acknowledged the independence of the United States, past quarrels ought to have been forgotten, and nothing remembered except our common blood, language, and institutions, and the many ties which still bind us together as the members of one nation, although now divided into two states. Unhappily, active causes were at work, especially in America, to break this harmony. All bodies of men love to dwell on the military fame of their fathers. War against England formed till lately the whole military history of the United States; and hence by a natural weakness (for many subjects much more really glorious to the nation might have been found) every public speaker, or writer, who wished to flatter his countrymen, enlarged on the events of that war, and, as a matter of course, abused poor old England. The festival of the 4th of July, which is in theory only the birthday of the nation, and on which all who can speak at all set themselves to laud the United States, became, in practice, an institution for blowing into a flame, year by year, the smouldering embers of national hatred. On this side of the Atlantic we had no such temptation. We have a long history to choose out of, and naturally find other subjects more pleasant than the memory of almost the only war in which we have been losers, and of which there is little to say, except that in its causes, administration, and results, it was a portentous complication of mismanagement. As a matter of fact, it soon passed out of memory. Few educated Englishmen now know more than the mere names even of the chief battles, or would be able to say which were won and which lost by the English. Many of us may remember how, when they first made the acquaintance of an American, they had to conceal their ignorance as best they could, while he spoke of affairs of which

they had never heard, as if they were household words sure to be familiar to them; and this after they had left college, with all the battle-fields of Greece and Rome, and the chief events of English history at their finger-ends.

Another cause of anti-English feeling in America has resulted from our own folly. English statesmen, in times past, made their country a party to the basest and most cruel of all tyrannies, that of the Orange faction over the people of Ireland. The Irish nation, naturally enough, has laid the blame of all its miseries on England, whose power alone enabled a detested minority to trample upon a nation. Few Englishmen, in fact, knew what was going on in Ireland, and of those few, probably every one was disgusted at it; but how were the sufferers to know that, and still more, how could they be expected to forgive and forget wrongs so enormous, because they were assured that the English nation, which ought to have prevented them, knew nothing about them? Neglect of a duty so pressing was, in itself, crime enough. And thus, every Irish emigrant who has landed in America, has carried with him, as a feeling second only to his love of old Ireland, an unquenchable hatred of England. Americans learned long ago, that a profession of hostility to England was the way to carry the "Irish vote;" and the "Irish vote" has been strong enough to turn every nicely-balanced election. Hence, to this very day, an American who appeals to the mob, clamours for war with England, although it is certain that, if he is in any sense a patriot or a statesman, nothing is farther from his real wishes.

Lastly, we are sorry to say that an ungenerous and unchristian fashion of sneering at the Americans has been indulged by some English writers. Of all conceivable treatment, the most intolerable is contempt. Time was when a contemptuous notice of the United States was an almost standing topic in the pages of the *Quarterly Review*. Many writers of travels adopted the same tone. Captain Basil Hall furnishes one example. To us it is simply wonderful that any respectable man should be willing to load himself with the guilt of exciting irritation, which may in the end produce bloody wars, and cost many thousands of lives, merely to indulge in the pleasure of smart writing, and perhaps only for the purpose of raising a laugh.

We are therefore heartily sorry to be compelled to admit that ever since the present war in America began, irrational anger against England has blazed up in the United States to a degree never before known. Thousands of American citizens, we doubt not, regret this as heartily as we do.

Neither side is so poor whether in the possession or the reputation of national courage, as to be afraid of professing that a war between the two great divisions of one family would be a great crime and an intolerable evil. Certainly, we are not ashamed to acknowledge it. But we would ask our American friends to consider how we can judge of their national feeling except by their newspapers, the speeches of politicians, or the official conduct of their statesmen. Now, for two years and more, all these have vied with each other in hostility to England. We have daily been assured that war with England is to be the first measure whenever the Union is restored. As for the cause of this war, few Americans seem to feel it necessary to allege any at all. Those who do, so far as we have seen, have accused England of not sympathizing with the United States in their present struggle, as if nations were to fight all who do not sympathize with them; or as if the threat of immediate war against us, as soon as the struggle is over, were likely to make us desire its speedy end. Yet in this, all who read American newspapers know that they are unanimous. When, for instance, the first turreted ship was named "the Monitor," the meaning of that name was publicly announced to be, that England was to take warning of what was preparing to be used against her. All through the war we have been assured, first, that England was immediately about to interfere on behalf of the South, and then that she has abstained from doing it merely from dastard fear. To pass from words to deeds, consider the studiously insulting conduct of Mr. Seward in the affair of the *Trent*. He ultimately admitted that he all along knew us to be in the right, yet he refused us any satisfaction to the last moment; obliged us to spend several millions in preparation for war, and did all he could to force from our government something which could be represented and resented as a threat. He allowed numerous bodies in the United States (among others, the House of Representatives) to commit themselves to an extravagant praise of Commodore Wilks and his outrage; and when, at last, after having waited till within two days of that on which our ambassador had been ordered to leave Washington, he surrendered the prisoners, he went out of his way to accompany the surrender with a declaration insulting to England. First, he declared that the only point in which Commodore Wilks was to blame, was in not bringing the *Trent* before a prize court for condemnation; next, that our demand was an abandonment of our principles on all the questions which we had ever discussed with the United States; and lastly, that he would not have surrendered the prisoners if the

United States had had any interest in detaining them. We can account for conduct so unpardonable in a man of Mr. Seward's admitted ability, only by supposing that he wished to gain popularity by flattering the unfortunate animosity prevalent against England.

We have said these things in sorrow, not in anger; and upon our countrymen we would urge them as a special reason why we should be doubly careful to conduct ourselves towards the United States with all possible consideration, and as far as may be with sympathy. Anger is the worst of counsellors, and we may so naturally feel angry, that we ought to be more than commonly watchful not to be swayed by it.

Unfortunately, within the last few months matters have sprung up which could not fail to provoke angry feeling in America. The trade of the United States has grievously suffered by ships built and fitted up in English ports, and, it is said, manned chiefly by English seamen. What must be still more provoking, the trade of England has benefited by the loss of America; for merchants, afraid of capture, have embarked their goods in British ships. Whether the British government has really given the United States any just cause of complaint in this matter we shall not now inquire, especially as the whole subject is before the courts, and, as far as we are concerned, may stand over. But it is notorious that the Americans believe—and, considering the feeling they had before cherished, they must naturally have believed—that we have been intentionally injuring them. This is not the cause of their threats of war, for it came after them. But to themselves it may seem to offer a plausible justification for the language they have used. Surely, therefore, our business is to examine the whole aspect of the present war, and especially its bearing on the question of slavery, with studious and special fairness; to consider the appearance which matters must wear in the eyes of the Americans, and to avoid everything which can be even mistaken for hostile feeling. And—shall we confess it? it seems to us that the motives and conduct of the United States have not, as yet, been thus judged in England.

No doubt the feeling general on this side of the Atlantic when the secession of the Southern States first took place was wholly in favour of the Union. But partly owing to the conduct we have already mentioned, partly from other causes, it has changed, and the English sympathy is now predominantly on the side of the South. This we regret. As Englishmen we need not wish to see the Union restored, still less need we desire its restoration by conquest. But we feel

that there is much that deserves our sympathy in the public feeling of the Northern States, and we are sorry not to see it freely and generously given. Mr. Carlyle's now celebrated "American Iliad in a nutshell" made the war turn solely on the fact that the "Northern Americans hire their servants by the month, while those in the South hire them for life." Nothing could be more unfair; and yet even this implies one fact which few Englishmen now admit; namely, that its real cause is the slave question. And this is so important that we must beg to be excused if we say something about it.

The seceding States, of course, in appealing to Englishmen, never put forward slavery as the motive of secession; for perhaps the most hearty and enthusiastic feeling of the English people, next to hatred of Popery, has been hatred of slavery. Hence the apologists of secession in England have generally insisted on the tariff, sometimes on national independence, never on slavery. We are far from surprised that the Southern commissioner, Mr. Yancy, should have assured Lord Russell that it is a total mistake to suppose slavery to be the real cause for secession. But we are bound to say that we have never seen a single declaration or manifesto, or a single speech of any leading politician, intended not for English eyes but for the people of the Southern States themselves, in which slavery has not been openly declared to be so. In these declarations, no doubt, we have the truth; for in addressing the people themselves, men must appeal to their genuine feelings and sentiments.

Our space will allow us to give a very few instances. To begin with the public ordinance of secession passed by the people of South Carolina, December 20th, 1860, that is, a few days after Mr. Lincoln's election. Whether this was an act of rebellion, or a legitimate exercise of supreme authority, it was, at least, a solemn and most momentous act. South Carolina withdrew from the United States, of which it had been by its own free choice a member for eighty years. So grave a step could not be taken without assigning some reasons; and those given are chiefly two:—namely, "the election to the high dignity of President of the United States, of a man whose opinions and designs were opposed to slavery;" and that in fourteen of the Northern States, state laws had been passed practically nullifying the "fugitive slave law," by which slaves escaping from their masters into free States were to be given up to them. South Carolina was immediately joined by the other cotton States, and the convention which met at Montgomery put forth a new constitution, under which they are still united. In this they declare "the

Confederate States are capable of acquiring new territories. In these territories the institution of African slavery, as it now exists in the Confederate States, shall be recognized and protected by the Congress of the territorial government."

At the same time Mr. Jefferson Davis was elected president, and Mr. Stephens vice-president. The latter, only a few days afterwards, publicly declared the sense in which he understood the new constitution. He said:—

Our new constitution solves all the important questions relating to our peculiar institutions. *The immediate cause of the late rupture is slavery.* That the old Union would some day or other be wrecked upon this rock, was clearly foreseen by Jefferson. He was right. The ruling principle admitted by him, and by most statesmen of his time, was that the slavery of the African race was a violation of natural rights. But these principles were fundamentally false; they were founded on the equality of the races. This is an error; the edifice was built upon a foundation of sand. Our new government is founded upon exactly contrary principles; its foundations are laid, its corner-stone rests upon this great truth—that the negro is not the equal of the white, and that slavery, subordination to the superior race, is his natural and normal condition. Our government is the first in the history of the world which rests upon this great physical, philosophical, and moral truth. The negro, in virtue of his nature, and by the consequences of the curse of Ham, is formed for the situation which he occupies in our system. This is the stone which the builders rejected, and which is become the corner-stone of the new building.

Words could not be much clearer than these. But Mr. Stephens goes farther on the subject of the tariff, which, we may remark in passing, is not even alluded to by the ordinance of the State of South Carolina in assigning the grounds for secession. He says:—

My friend Mr. Tombs has mentioned as one of the secondary causes which ought to determine the South in favour of separation—the question of the tariff. A few words will suffice to do justice to this grievance. When I first entered into public life, in 1832, South Carolina was threatening to secede from the Union upon the question of the tariff. But that difficulty was removed, and since 1833 we have had no ground for complaint on the subject of the tariff. The present tariff was voted for by South Carolina as well as by Massachusetts. To say, therefore, that the South is compelled to pay duties arbitrarily imposed by the North, is contrary to fact; since the representatives of Massachusetts are ready unanimously to lower the duties as much as the men at the South have demanded.

It is impossible that a man who was at the very time a candidate for the second place in the proposed confederation, should have dared publicly to speak thus if the popular feeling in favour of secession had really been excited by the tariff.

He would have alienated from himself the whole sympathy of the nation. Mr. Stephens, no doubt, knew what he was doing. He knew that it was safe to make light of all grievances except one; that one was, the growing feeling in the Northern States against slavery. It is hardly necessary to give additional proofs, and our limits do not permit it. Those who desire them will find them in the works of M. Cochin and others. We shall, therefore, take it as proved, that as far as the people of the South are concerned, slavery is the real cause of secession.

In fact, there is only one objection to this conclusion, and it is, that the Northern States had no intention of abolishing slavery; that they were willing, nay, ostentatiously desirous, to maintain it; and that the "institution," so far from being secured by secession, has been and is endangered by it.

All this we admit. Since the secession the attention of most Englishmen has been more or less turned to the constitution of the United States, and it may therefore now be needless to explain that every State is acknowledged to be sovereign and independent, except so far as it has voluntarily given up its rights by joining the Union. The only question is, whether among the powers which it retained, that of withdrawing from the Union at pleasure is or is not included. At present, the Southern States maintain that this power exists; the Northern States deny it. But there is, we believe, no State in the Union which has not, in its turn, maintained it, and actually threatened to secede when the government of the Union acted in some manner opposed to its separate interests. The New England States, for instance, which are strongest in their condemnation of the present "rebellion," were on the point of seceding in 1815, when the blockade of the American ports, in consequence of the war with England, for the time destroyed their commerce. But what is agreed on all hands is, that the Congress or parliament of the United States is not sovereign, like the British parliament. Its powers extend only to such subjects as are committed to it by the original agreement of the different States. In few words, these include only the foreign relations of the United States, and a few points, such as taxation, war, and peace, &c., which are closely connected with them. Specially, it can touch no internal arrangements in any State. Each State has its own legislature and its own executive, which are upon all these matters supreme. The Congress of the United States has not, and has never had, any more power than the British parliament to abolish slavery in any State,—South Carolina for instance; or to establish it in any State; as, for

instance, New York. Again, the whole criminal law of each State is enacted solely by its own special legislature. Thus in all the Southern States it is forbidden, by State laws, under very heavy penalties, to teach any slave to read; and again, no person of colour is allowed to be in the streets, without a written pass, after sunset. No laws on these subjects, being, as they are, merely internal affairs, could have been passed, or can be repealed, by the Congress of the United States. A notion has prevailed in England, that the election of Mr. Lincoln (as a person known to be opposed to slavery) threatened the safety of the institution in the States where it existed. No mistake could be greater. In the United States, we believe, no individual, certainly no statesman, has even so much as suggested that (except as a consequence of civil war, and while it is actually raging) either the President, or the President and Congress together, could (even if so minded) abolish or modify slavery in any one State.*

A European may naturally answer, that such limitations upon a legislature are futile and invalid; that the President and Congress, as being the sovereign authority, might at any time pass an act to extend their own powers, and might then, under the constitution so amended, interfere with slavery. But against this eventuality the American constitution had guarded. The "Supreme Court of the United States," a judicial authority placed entirely above the power both of President and Congress, was authorized by the constitution to set aside and declare null and void, without appeal, any act passed by Congress which it decided to be beyond its powers. This power of the "Supreme Court" is by no means theoretical. It has already been exercised in several instances, and it is unquestionably certain that if the Congress had taken upon itself to legislate in the internal affairs of any State, the act would at once have been nullified. The Congress was therefore in no sense a sovereign power. It exercised a jurisdiction merely delegated to it by the States, and an authority was provided to set aside its decrees, if they went beyond the limits of that delegated jurisdiction. All comparisons, therefore, between the Congress and such bodies as the British Parliament are out of place. Parliament may, indeed, be said to be bound by the conditions of the Acts of Union with Scotland and with Ireland. There is a strong moral obligation.

* M. Cochin thinks the Congress might abolish slavery. We are surprised that so able and well-read a man can be so far misled even by his strongest feelings. No doubt the feeling which misled him is one worthy of the true nobility of his character and of his Catholic faith and virtues.

But if a necessity should arise for varying the terms of those treaties, it is only by Parliament that they can possibly be varied; and by Parliament both of them have already been varied. We all know that complaints have been made of such departures from the treaties of union; but, inasmuch as the British monarch, acting with the advice and authority of Parliament, is supreme, there is no remedy; in fact, none can be imagined, except either that of persuading Parliament to repeal its act, or else overthrowing its power by a revolution. The Congress of the United States is not supreme, not only because its powers are limited by the constitution, but, still more, because an authority is provided which can set aside its acts whenever it exceeds those limits. It may, of course, be replied that the President and Congress, being stronger than the Supreme Court, might set it at defiance. This, however, is merely to say that revolutions are conceivable in all countries. As a matter of fact, no President and no Congress has ever ventured upon any attempt of the kind. They have never (before the present war) wielded any physical force which would have made it possible; and if the Southern, or any other States of the Union, had had recourse to force in consequence of any such revolutionary measure, we doubt not the whole physical force of all the respectable classes in every State would unanimously have supported them; and their combined strength would have been irresistible.

As, then, no President or Congress of the United States could have assailed the institution of slavery in any State which chose to maintain it, it may reasonably be asked, what evil the cotton States feared from Mr. Lincoln's election.

The answer is, that their defeat in the election of 1860 convinced them that they must henceforth expect to see the federal administration of the Union carried on upon principles unfavourable to slavery. This implied a total and absolute change in the whole system of the Federal government, and one which they were prepared to go all lengths to prevent. They preferred separation to union on such terms.

Up to 1860 the Slave States had, for many years, been masters of the Union. This is more remarkable, because their free inhabitants were a minority, trifling in comparison with those of the Free States; and in a country in which the universal suffrage of the white men was the sovereign power, it might be supposed that they would always have been outvoted. But, by an arrangement made in the original constitution, the votes of the whites in the Slave States weighed more than those of an equal number in the Free States. The number of representatives for each State is regulated by the

population; and in this calculation five slaves count as three free white men. Consequently, if in any State the free whites were 300,000 and the slaves 500,000, the vote of that State, which would be exercised only by the free whites, would weigh the same as that of a State containing 600,000 whites; that is, the power of each individual freeman would be double.

But the actual power of the South has gone much beyond this. The Free States have always been divided between political parties which have in general been pretty nearly balanced. The vote of the South has always been decided almost wholly by the slave interest. Voting together, therefore, the Southern States have in times past been able to give a majority to whichever party in the North they resolved to support. The result has been, that the federal government has almost always been in the hands either of Southern men, or, at least, of men from the North whose politics were subservient to the slave interest. Thus, although the Free States immensely outweigh the South in population, in wealth, in intellectual and commercial activity, in domestic and foreign trade,*—in a word, by whatever gauge we try them—in political power, and in that alone, they have always been inferior. So decided has been this inferiority, that in the last seventy-two years there have been eighteen elections and re-elections of Presidents, of which twelve have returned slaveholders, and only six Northern men. Twenty-three Southern secretaries of state have held office together during forty years; nine men from the Free States have held office during twenty-nine years. Only three Presidents have, since 1809, been Northern men; and in almost every instance even these Northern men have owed their election to a Southern vote, and have been decided in their support of Southern interests.

Now, although no Federal Government could abolish slavery, it is easy to any Federal Government to promote the

* We extract a few statistical facts from M. Cochin. The custom-house receipts for 1854, for the Free States, were 60,010,489 dollars; for the Slave States, 5,136,939; banking capital, 230,100,340, against 107,078,940; canals and railroads, 538,313,647, against 95,252,581; exports, 167,520,693, against 107,480,688; imports, 236,847,810, against 24,586,528; tonnage, 4,252,615, against 855,517; manufactures produce 842,586,058 dollars, against 165,520,693. As to population, the whites in the Free States are 18,669,061, against 8,038,996 in the Slave States. The whole population is 18,893,856, against 12,240,294. And yet the extent of the Slave States is 851,448 square miles, against 612,597 in the Free States. The soil is, on the average, far more prolific, and they have been as long peopled. We believe that the only possible explanation of the inferiority of the Slave States is the plague of slavery. The produce in hay alone in the Free States exceeds in value the produce of the Slave States in cotton, tobacco, rice, hay, hemp, and cane-sugar.

slave-holding interest. First, as to the admission of new States, there has been a constant race between the two interests; for, as each State sends two members to the Senate, the number of States of each class decides the number of Senators. These new States are made out of the "Territories." A glance at the map will show that to the west of the inhabited States there lies an immense district as yet unpeopled. Into this vast district an emigrant population is continually pouring from Europe and from the old States; and for years it has been always disputed whether the territories thus gradually filling up shall admit slavery or not. They may, if Congress is so pleased, be admitted into the Union as States, as soon as they have attained a certain population. As soon as they become States, they have (as we have seen) the right of settling all internal questions for themselves. Until then, they are subject to the central government. Whether they will, when they become independent, decide for slavery or for freedom, depends upon the institutions gradually established while they are territories. If our space allowed, we could show that, owing to the political preponderance of the Slave States, these questions have hitherto been decided in the interest of slavery. M. Cochin's book gives the details. Again, the majority of the judges of the Supreme Court, by whom all questions as to the constitution and disputes between different States are settled without appeal, have always been Southern men. They are nominated by the President, subject to the approval of the Senate.

The laws for restoring to their masters slaves who have escaped into the Free States ("Fugitive Slave Laws") have been passed in the same interest.

The "District of Columbia" (that is, the small province in which the capital, Washington, is situated) has no legislature of its own, and its laws are made by the Congress of the Union. Here, therefore, the President and Congress have the power of admitting or excluding slavery as they please. In fact, down to the outbreak of the present war, slavery has always been maintained in it. The anti-slavery party in the Northern States began to exercise their undoubted constitutional right, by petitioning the Congress to abolish slavery in the district of Columbia. This would, among other things, prevent the Southern members of the Federal Government from bringing their slaves with them. It would also prevent the sad scandal described by European travellers, of a public market for the sale and purchase of slaves close under the shadow of the palace of the Legislature and the President. The proposal, therefore, was received with indignation by the Southern men,

and Congress, under their influence, resolved not to receive any petitions of this nature.

The whole foreign relations of the Union have been systematically and habitually managed in the interest of slavery. This is the explanation of the disgraceful conduct of the Government of the Union towards Mexico and towards Spain. The systematic fraud and aggression by which Texas was annexed to the Union is one of the most disgraceful pages of modern history. The one object of this great national crime was that the Slave States might obtain possession of a huge district, admirably suited both by soil and climate for negro labour, out of which additional Slave States might hereafter be formed. Slavery had been abolished throughout the whole Mexican territory. It has been reintroduced into Texas by the United States; and a prospective arrangement has been made, by which the district is to be divided into four Slave States (each of which will send two members to the Senate), as soon as its population is sufficient. Texas has thus been added to the lands set apart for the misery, degradation, and demoralization of slavery for all future time. It is naturally one of the richest countries in the world, and about as extensive as France, together with England and Wales.

The annexation of Texas led to the Mexican war, and this war terminated in the acquisition by conquest of vast additional territories designed for future Slave States. With regard to one of them, California, this intention has been frustrated by the discovery of gold, which has led to so great an influx of white emigrants that the inhabitants have resolved not to admit slavery. This the South could not prevent; but as California refused to admit slavery, it vehemently opposed the demand of California to be admitted as a State. The dissolution of the Union was threatened, if it was admitted as a free State; and, at last, the difficulty was only got over, after a long and fierce dispute, by a compromise very offensive to the Northern States.

Cuba is, we need hardly say, one of the richest and most beautiful islands in the world, and contains a very large slave population. It would make, at least, two additional Slave States. Hence, the continual attempts of "filibusters" from the Slave States to annex it. These having failed, the ministers representing the United States at the courts of London, Paris, and Madrid, held a meeting at Ostend, and put forward a declaration, which, for shameless insolence, has, we believe, no parallel in modern times. These gentlemen, Messrs. Buchanan, Mason, and Soulé, proposed to offer to Spain 120 millions of dollars for Cuba, adding—

It is perfectly clear to every reflecting man, that by its geographical situation, Cuba naturally belongs to us. If Spain, deaf to the voice of her own interest, and influenced by a blind pride and a false sense of honour, should refuse to sell the island of Cuba to the United States, we shall then, by all laws, human and divine, have the right to take it from Spain, if we can.

After publicly putting his name to this declaration, Mr. Buchanan was elected President of the Union by Southern influence, and as President he proposed to Congress to carry out the Ostend declaration, by appropriating a sum of money for the purchase of Cuba; it being notorious that Spain resented the proposal as an insult.

M. Cochin traces at length the aggressive policy of the Union with regard to the States of central America. This subject alone, if adequately handled, would occupy more than the space allowed to this article. There, as everywhere else, the slave interest has wielded for its own purposes the whole foreign policy of the Union. The fear of secession was sufficient to make the Northern States consent to anything, however degrading to the nation.

A measure was demanded, under Mr. Buchanan's presidency, to forbid the circulation, through the post-office, of any papers or publications unfavourable to slavery, and we have little doubt it would have been carried if the act of secession had been a little longer delayed.

The same fatal influence has been apparent in the conduct of the United States with regard to the slave-trade. For the first few years after the independence of America, slavery was regarded by all parties as a doomed institution. The encouragement of the slave-trade had been urged by the very States which are now fighting for slavery, as one of the main subjects of complaint against the British government; and a proposal made by Jefferson for the immediate abolition of slavery, on the settlement of the original constitution, was lost only by a single vote. While things were in this state the slave-trade was abolished, and stamped by the municipal law of America with the brand of piracy. Most happy that it was so; for but a few years later there would have been no chance of the passing of such a law. The development of the cotton manufacture, owing to the inventions of Arkwright, &c., made slavery appear profitable; and in the very States which had lately condemned it, it has become a cherished institution. Had this change taken place before the abolition of the slave-trade, it is too certain that it would never have been abolished. It was, however, too late for the South to

preserve, and it was unable to restore it. Yet such has been the effect of Southern influence that the abolition has been systematically evaded. The contraband importation of negroes has been continued, and the government of the Union has always refused to take effectual measures for putting a stop to it. So far has this been carried, that, although the great amount of slave-trading carried on under the American flag has been notorious, the American government has never either put it down or allowed it to be put down by others. All the other maritime nations have made treaties with Great Britain conceding a mutual right of search for the suppression of the slave-trade. The United States alone have refused to do so. The excuse has been, jealousy for the honour of their flag. That it was a mere excuse, has been proved by the fact, that while refusing to allow us to seize American slavers, they have taken care not to seize them themselves. From 1813, when the slave-trade was declared piracy, till after the commencement of the present war, no American citizen has been punished for slave-trading, notorious as the continuance of the wicked traffic has been. And the very last of the many quarrels of the United States with England, as recently as the latter part of the presidentship of Mr. Buchanan, was because—while admitting that we had no right to stop an American ship, although known to be full of slaves—we claimed to examine slavers of other nations, which for their protection hoisted the American flag, merely for the purpose of examining whether they were really American, or whether they belonged to one of the powers which had by treaty conceded to us the right of search.

We have said enough to prove our assertion that for many years the foreign policy of the whole Union had been subordinate to the interests of slavery. We are sorry to be obliged to add that, the power which it obtained had secured for it humiliating sacrifices, not from the Northern States only, but from our own and other European governments. To mention one shameful instance. The Slave States have always been most sensitively jealous of admitting free negroes. In many of them manumission is absolutely forbidden by law, except on condition that the freed black shall be sent out of the State at the cost of his late owner. In all of them, we believe, free negroes are forbidden to enter the State. In the harbour of Charleston, however, the great commercial port of the South, which European ships were continually frequenting, it was found that a large part of their crews consisted of free negroes. A State law was accordingly passed, by which every man of colour who entered the harbour, in any ship, of any

nation, was to be taken from his ship and committed to prison, to be maintained there as long as the ship remained in the harbour, at the cost of the owner, and to be restored on its departure, only on condition of the payment of expenses. If these expenses were not, or could not be paid, the law required that he should be sold to defray them. For years past has this iniquitous and insulting law been rigorously carried out with regard to British subjects; every one of whom has as much right as Lord Palmerston himself to cry *Civis Romanus sum*. For, strange as it must seem to an American, our laws and institutions recognize no difference between those whom he calls "niggers" and any other British subject. To us there is no difference in principle between this law of South Carolina and a law which should direct the imprisoning and selling as a slave of any other British subject unconvicted, nay unaccused, of any offence — for instance, because his hair was red or black, or because there was not in his veins any mixture of negro blood. For, be it remembered, that there is nothing in our institutions to prevent every member of the next House of Commons, and every member of the next generation of Peers, from being a "nigger" in the sense in which that name of obloquy is used in America, where it extends to all who have any mixture of negro blood on either side. At this moment it is no secret that one such "nigger" — who, if any accident took him into the port of Charleston, would be liable by law to be imprisoned and sold as a slave, — actually sits in the British House of Peers. Can any greater insult to the British flag be imagined? And it exists, not merely in theory, but in practice. The attention of her Majesty's Ministers has before now been called to the fact in the House of Commons, and the British lion submitted without a growl. No one will ask why. It was not because we feared the puny state of South Carolina, but because the influence of the Slave States over the Federal government enlisted the whole power of the Union on behalf of anything, however monstrous, which they judged necessary for the security of their "peculiar institution." How long would Lord Palmerston have borne such an insult from Greece, Naples, or Brazil? *

* We have been unable to ascertain whether or not this law has ever been enforced against the officers or men of British ships of war which chanced to visit Charleston. That men of colour, or what are called in the United States "niggers," have been captains in the British navy, we know. That such may now be the case is likely enough; that many serve in the navy is notorious. We are assured that the law of the State of South Carolina makes no

In proportion to the power which the slave interest had so long wielded, by means of the Union, was the rage of the Southern politicians when they saw it passing out of their hands. For many years an anti-slavery party had been gaining strength in the Northern States. From most at least of the leaders of that party we are divided by serious fundamental differences. Into these we need not enter. Suffice it to say that many of them were disinterested, enthusiastic, nay, fanatical, in maintaining, with whatever alloy of error, a great and true principle. They believed slavery, in its modern American shape, to be a national sin; they were ready to do and to sacrifice anything for its destruction; and, in dealing with the masses of their countrymen, they had the strength which men enthusiastic in the promotion of any great truth have in dealing with those who, though not without generous impulses, are without fixed principles, and therefore ready to sway violently, first in one direction, then in another.

The influence of this party in the Northern States was greatly promoted by the violence of the South. Northern men suspected of anti-slavery sympathies were, in numerous instances, stripped, tarred and feathered, cruelly lashed, and even murdered, in Southern cities, and no redress could be obtained. Fugitive slaves, who had taken refuge in the Free States, some of whom (after having been abandoned as without value, by covetous owners) had been restored to health and strength by kind nursing and care, were forcibly seized and carried back into slavery. The law of the Union required all citizens to assist in their capture; and there were cases in which whole Northern cities had been thrown into mourning by seeing what they felt to be outrages committed in their own streets by the authority of law. Above all, it was evident that, as long as the Federal government was subservient to the slave-holding interest, slavery, with all its crimes and all its pollutions, would continually be extended to new and hitherto uninhabited districts. To this last degradation and misery, multitudes who had never professed or felt any sympathy with the abolitionist party, were resolved not to submit. Their resolution, far from being shaken, was strengthened by the decision of the "Supreme Court" in the case of *Dred Scott*. It ruled that slave-owners had a right to take and keep their slaves in every "territory" of the Union not yet formed into a state; and that this right could

exception in their favour. We may presume, therefore, that if the ships in which they serve happen to have entered Charleston harbour, they have been committed to prison.

not be taken from them by any act of the Congress or President, nor by any compromise, even although agreed to by all the Slave States. This decision changed the whole posture of affairs. For years it had been settled by a solemn Act of Congress, passed in virtue of a compromise agreed to by both parties, that slavery should never be lawful in any territory north of 36° 30' north latitude. This act, which had been repealed by Southern influence, was now declared *ab initio* null and void.

Whether, according to the letter of the constitution, the Supreme Court was right or wrong in this decision, it is not for us to decide. But men could not help remembering that the majority of its judges were slave-owners, appointed by Southern presidents in consequence of that political supremacy of the Slave States which had so long prevailed.

This decision gave new vigour to the party, which was resolved that, cost what it might, slavery should not extend itself beyond the limits of the States which it already occupied. It became strong under the name of the *Free Soil* party. By it Mr. Fremont was unsuccessfully brought forward as a candidate for the office of President in 1856, and by it (or by what was called the Republican party, of which it was the life) Mr. Lincoln was elected in 1860.

The constitution of the United States interposes a space of four months between the election of a new president and his entry upon office. Immediately on Mr. Lincoln's election, and while Mr. Buchanan was still president, the cotton States seceded. Mr. Buchanan publicly declared that no authority in the Union had any right to coerce a State by force, and invited the Congress to bring back the seceders by amending the existing constitution. The changes he required showed that he regarded slavery as the real cause of secession. He demanded an amendment of the constitution to reassure the slave-owners by a distinct recognition of their property; by a positive enactment that slavery should be recognized in every territory of the Union until it was constituted into a state; that fugitive slaves taking refuge in a Free State should be given up; and that all laws passed by different Northern States to prevent this should be annulled as unconstitutional. He added that he had long foreseen the present crisis, which he attributed wholly to the agitation of the anti-slavery question in the Northern States. The slaves, he said, were becoming unquiet. "At the South, security no longer reigns at the domestic hearth. If this apprehension continues, separation will be inevitable." M. Cochin remarks, that by thus attributing the secession to the spread of anti-slavery

opinions in the North, Mr. Buchanan, in fact, declared it to be beyond remedy; for what congress or what administration could put down these opinions?

At the same time, we must repeat, neither Mr. Lincoln nor the party which supported him had any thought of touching slavery in any State. Mr. Lincoln, from the first, solemnly declared that he had neither the will nor the power to do so. So far as we are aware, no person in the United States, whatever might be his own wishes and feelings, ever suggested anything of the sort. His election sounded the knell, not of slavery, but of the political influence of the slave-holders over the general policy of the Union.

Those who judge by the result may wonder that, if nothing more than this was at stake, the Slave States should have exposed themselves to all the horrors of civil war rather than submit without a struggle to the legitimate result of a fair election. But—not to mention that they had by degrees been worked up into a positive hatred of the Yankees, which was in itself quite enough to account for their acting on mere passion and against all reasonable calculations of interest—it is certain that they did not expect the consequences which have actually resulted; and it seems to us that they had no reason to expect them. There really was a very strong probability that they would be allowed to secede without serious opposition. And even if opposition were made, they had no doubt of their power to put it down. The authority and influence of the Union had for years been on their side. The military stores were in their power.* By far the ablest and most experienced men both in the naval and in the military services were on their side. Above all, they had a hearty contempt for the "Yankees," as a "nation of shopkeepers," and were wont to vaunt themselves as "fiery Southerners."

In fact, even in the North there was a very strong party quite willing to consent to a separation. The most violent anti-slavery men had long openly declared their desire that the Free States should renounce all union with the Slave States. Mr. Buchanan's government declared that the United States had no right to resist secession; and Dr. Brownson, who can hardly fail to be well informed, says that neither Mr. Lincoln nor his administration had any thought of resisting it by force, but intended to allow it to take place in

* Mr. Buchanan's administration has been generally accused of having treacherously placed almost the whole of the military stores in the Southern States, where they might be seized by the seceders.

peace. For ourselves, we believe that this would have been the truest policy for those who were bent on preserving the Union, for we are strongly persuaded that the Slave States, if they had been left alone, would before long have found that they had committed something more than a crime—a blunder, and would have been anxious to return, even though it were on terms much more equal than those of the old Union. But the blood of the nation was stirred by the attack upon Fort Sumter, and it is most true, as Mr. Cobden says, that a nation which has once got into war is for the time beside itself. When the United States will once again be in their right mind, God only knows.

That secession, if it had been allowed to take place in peace, would have been a blunder on the part of the Slave States, we cannot doubt. The Federal government might possibly have been much less favourable to slavery than in times past, although even that was far from certain, considering how rapid is the ebb and flow of parties in America, and how skilful the Southerners have always shown themselves to be in supporting any party which promises to do most for their “peculiar institution.” But taking matters at the worst, all they could have lost would have been the opportunity of extending slavery to new territories. Within their own boundary it was safe. Secession, on the contrary, on whatever terms it had been effected, would have given them an immediate neighbour hostile to slavery—a “Canada at their own door.”

It would seem, then, that the seceding States had more to fear from separation than from union, even on the least favourable terms. But the truth is, that Southern statesmen were chiefly influenced, not so much by fear, as by hope. They had in view a great object, which, under the Union, they could never hope to attain, but on which they confidently reckoned as soon as they were formed into an independent confederacy. This object was the legal re-opening of the African slave-trade.

Every independent nation, except so far as it is bound by treaty, has the power to legalize and carry on the slave-trade. There is in England a common mistake upon this subject, arising from the use of the word piracy with regard to the slave-trade. Pirates, no doubt, may, by the law of nations, be taken and destroyed without any regard to their nationality, by any ship of war which meets them; but this is the case only with those who are pirates by the law of nations. The slave-trade, wicked as it is, is not piracy by the law of nations. It has been declared piracy by the statute law of

England and many other states. But this statute law no government can enforce, except upon its own subjects, or upon the subjects of other governments which have, by treaty, given it a right to do so. If, therefore, the Southern confederacy were once recognized as an independent power, it would (unless restrained by a positive treaty) have power to legalize the slave-trade, and no other nation could interfere, unless it chose to make it a *casus belli*, a measure never yet contemplated. We believe that the deliberate intention of reviving the slave-trade, far more than any fear of interference with slavery at home, was the real motive of secession. Whether in the Union or out of it, the more numerous and more extensive are the Slave States, the greater will be their power and influence. Hence the extreme anxiety of all Southern States to push forward slavery into new districts,—a desire which at first sight seems strange; for ever since the abolition of the African slave-trade the price of slaves has been rising, and, before the present war, had become a cause of serious inconvenience to the planters. Of course, if the area of slave cultivation was to be doubled by the annexation of Texas and other provinces of Mexico, that price must be expected to rise still higher with the increased demand for slaves. Already there has for years been an internal trade in slaves bred in the older states (Virginia, Kentucky, &c.), and sold into the new plantations. That the planters, therefore, really designed to take the first opportunity of restoring the slave-trade, we might have inferred from their continual anxiety to extend slavery to new districts. But we are not left to inference. Ever since negroes have become inconveniently dear, there has been an increasing clamour for the reopening of the slave-trade. That we should hear little of it in England is natural enough. In Mr. Spence's letters to the *Times*, for instance, or in his book, there is not a trace of it. Even in the United States it was at first put forward chiefly by anonymous writers in Southern newspapers. But Mr. Olmsted gives extracts from all the leading newspapers of the Slave States, which one and all speak out upon the subject; * and he says that for some years past, not one newspaper published south of Washington has taken any other view. More than this: several years ago,

Two grand juries of South Carolina recommended, in the most solemn manner, a renewed importation of slaves from Africa, as the only remedy which the pride of the people of the State will permit them to make use of

* See "Back Country," chap. viii., and "Seaboard States," chap. viii.

for their half-acknowledged debility. A committee of the State legislature, to which the subject was referred, has given its approval of the measure on theological, moral, and economical grounds, though recommending, from considerations of temporary policy, that no action should at present be taken in the matter.

Mr. De Bow, a well-known Southern writer, has published a letter to Mr. Yancy, strongly urging the measure, extracts from which are given by Olmsted. From individuals, the subject was already passing into the hands of the authorities, when the war began. The governor of South Carolina, in a formal and official message to the legislature, in 1856, says:—

To maintain our position, we must have cheap labour. This is possible only through one means—the *reopening of the slave-trade*; and nothing but a mawkish sentimentality would swoon at the idea of legalizing this trade.

M. Cochin adds that the government of the State of Alabama has since repeated the same wish. It is curious, that one man who has taken the lead in the matter is the gentleman on whose behalf England was (rightly and justly) on the brink of war with the United States—Mr. Slidell, the representative of the Southern Confederation at Paris. He actually proposed, in the legislature of his State, that the first step should be taken towards the restoration of the slave-trade, by giving notice to England and France that the United States would withdraw from the treaties which now bind them to put it down. Mr. Olmsted says there was already, when he wrote, far more promise of success in restoring the slave-trade than there had been a few years before in favour of the “Fugitive Slave Laws.”

But, perhaps, the strongest testimony is that of an official dispatch of Lord Lyons, her Majesty’s Minister at Washington, to Lord Russell. No one suspects the British government of prejudices against the seceders; what he says, therefore, may be considered as the reluctant admission of a friend. Writing, December 15th, 1860, that is, only a few days before the first act of secession (that of South Carolina, December 24th, 1860), he says:—

I much fear that we have little moderation to expect on the part of the cotton States. They seem to believe that the necessity of obtaining sufficient supplies of cotton will compel all Europe—and especially Great Britain—to treat with them on their own terms. Many of the leaders of the movement openly talk of restoring the slave-trade. Any such attempt would immediately be put down by the combined force of the North, of Great Britain, and of united Europe. But, on the other hand, it will be exceedingly difficult to bring the Slave States to renounce on principle the right to carry on the slave-trade, or to induce them to bind themselves by treaty upon this subject.

Any such engagement they would consider as an admission that they are in the wrong upon the question, which, in their dispute with the North, now inflames their passions to such a degree that they have lost sight of reason. How can they bind themselves not to extend to a greater number of Africans the benefits of slavery, which they consider as a state ordained by God for the benefit and improvement of the negro race?

The argument of Lord Lyons is irresistible. If the Southern politicians really believe slavery to be the happiest and best position in which the negro can be placed, and that more negro labour is the great necessity of the whites, upon what principle can they scruple to restore the slave-trade? Their own actions have since confirmed his anticipations. In the summer of 1863 the Southern army invaded Pennsylvania. For a short time they occupied a country in which there is not a single slave, but many free negroes; and every free negro upon whom they could lay hands was seized, sent off to the South, and there sold as a slave. We need hardly say, that in favour of this unparalleled and almost incredible outrage, no one of the apologies commonly urged in behalf of the African slave-trade will apply. These men were not savages. They were not heathens. They were not even prisoners of war. They were not bought from barbarous heathen chiefs in order to save their lives. They were the unarmed, unoffending peasantry of a civilized and Christian country. They had no elective franchise or political power, and therefore could be in no degree, directly or indirectly, responsible for the war between the Northern and Southern States. Except only their colour, there was in every respect as little excuse for selling them as slaves as there would have been if the French had sold the peasants of Lombardy in the war in 1859, or if the Duke of Wellington and Blucher had sold the peasants of Picardy in 1815.*

It seems, then, that the real object and expectation of the seceding States was to establish themselves as an independent

* We have no doubt of the truth of the above statement, which has been several times positively repeated, with details, by an able writer (the correspondent of the *Guardian* newspaper, at Philadelphia), and never contradicted, although attention has been continually called to it, and contradictions invited. (See *Weekly Register*.) Believing it to be correct, we consider nothing more remarkable than the fact that, so far as we have been able to ascertain, it has not created any outcry or indignation even in the Free States of the Union. In fact, both sides seem to have regarded it as a matter of course, that a Southern army should make slaves of all negroes it could catch. We fear this must be taken as one more indication of the state of feeling in the North with regard to the free negroes. Would not the Northern whites regard as a public benefactor any one who should rid them of the free negroes without their own act?

nation, without any serious opposition; to take with them out of the Union, not only the States already cultivated by negro slaves, but the immense fertile regions of the Southwest, including Texas, New Mexico, &c. &c., districts much larger than the whole States now peopled by slaves; to annex, from time to time, as suited their convenience, Cuba, Mexico, and Central America, &c., districts which (as Mr. Buchanan, Mr. Mason, and Mr. Soulé, united at Ostend to declare, in 1854) "naturally belong" to them; and by actively pushing forward the African slave-trade, to people all these vast regions with happy contented slaves (humanely rescued from the miseries of Africa), and with their devoted servants and nurses, the white masters and mistresses; thus leaving to future ages all the southern part of North America as the brightest and most perfect example of the lot of man upon earth.

Let us hear how a Protestant clergyman at New Orleans describes, not in a pamphlet or from a platform, but from the pulpit, this view of the "manifest destiny" of the Southern States: *—

Need I pause to prove that the foundation of our material interests is slavery; that our wealth consists in the land, and in those who cultivate it; and that, from the nature of our products, labour which we can command is indispensable to us? This proves the solemn commission which we have received, and which consists in perpetuating and extending our system of slavery, and in giving it the right to go and take root everywhere, *whither nature and Providence may carry it*. Of this duty we will acquit ourselves even in the face of the most terrible dangers. What though war combine all evils? If it need be that we appeal to the sword, we will not shrink from the baptism of fire—we will not drop the sword until our last soldier shall have fallen behind the last rampart. The position of the South at this moment is sublime: if it obtains from God grace to know what its work is, it will save itself by saving America and the world.

The original object of the present war, then, as far as the seceding States are concerned, may be summed up in the words "Slavery and the Slave-trade."† On the side of the

* We translate from the French of M. Moreau in the *Correspondant* for October, 1862.

† There is an article in the *Saturday Review* of Feb. 20 which strongly supports our position, that modern negro slavery is indissolubly bound up with the accursed African slave-trade. "Clarkson and Wilberforce," says the writer, "were fully aware that in denouncing the slave-trade they were virtually condemning the social condition which it fed and encouraged;" and "the consistent advocates of slavery since they turned to bay against their abolitionist adversaries, have frequently accepted the *logical consequence of their own principles*, by asserting that negroes ought to be imported as freely as apes." This admission is the more remarkable, as being found in a journal which has consistently advocated the cause of the South.

North it was, in a word, the maintenance of the Union. For this, the leading statesmen had already shown that they were willing to make any sacrifice; and although there was a party with whom an eager and even enthusiastic hatred of slavery overbalanced all other considerations, they were a small and a very unpopular minority. This, it is hardly necessary to prove, for in England no one questions it. It is enough to say that Mr. Lincoln has over and over again declared the restoration of the Union to be the one object of the war; that to restore the Union he was willing, if necessary, to perpetuate for ever the slavery of all the existing slaves, and of all their posterity; or that, to restore it he would set free all the slaves; or again, if that would best effect it, that he would set free some and retain others in slavery. We may mention similar declarations on the part of one other person who (as Catholic readers are well aware) is highly esteemed in the Northern States for political talent, and who has zealously advocated the abolitionist proclamation of Mr. Lincoln. Dr. Brownson repeats over and over again, till his readers are weary, such declarations as these:—

That man who can say that he is willing to put down the rebellion, though its suppression should establish slavery more firmly than ever, we hold to be a true America citizen, and we honour him, we love him. For us to say it would be nothing ["us," in the strange jargon of this able writer, means, we need hardly say, "me"]. We recognize as a patriot no man who does not hate the rebellion even more than he hates slavery.

In fact, any one who knows how the free negroes have for many years been regarded and treated by the white men in the Northern States, must see that the notion of a long and bloody war undertaken by the United States out of humane consideration for the negro slaves would be as absurd as if England should profess to go to war with France in order to prevent the French from treating with cruelty their horses and dogs.

That the Northern statesmen should be willing to sacrifice anything for the Union is most natural. The great weakness of Americans is a blind admiration of mere magnitude and extent. They have long been lost in wondering joy at the space they occupy in the map of the world. Moreover, they have felt sure that their "manifest destiny" was to unite the whole of North America in one body politic under the best institutions that ever existed, and to dictate laws to the rest of mankind. Never did ancient Romans more confidently anticipate universal, unlimited, perpetual empire. At the same time, their having practically no neighbours except those

who were waiting like the prisoners in the cavern of Polyphemos, each hoping to be the last devoured, has exempted them from the necessity of maintaining an army and navy; and thus their wealth became almost embarrassing to them. They have long been puzzled, not like other nations, how to raise the funds necessary for their expenditure, but what to do with the money paid for duties imposed for the purpose of protection. If the American continent were to be henceforth divided between two great confederacies, they must abandon their ambitious hopes, and be content to enter into something of a balance of power like other nations. No wonder this seemed intolerable—how intolerable, we may in some degree imagine, when we find a man usually so conservative as Brownson, hurried away by his feelings into an extreme of Jacobinism, and actually reproaching the government for not hanging without form of law all who express, in any manner, however legal and constitutional, a desire for the restoration of peace. We extract a few words from several pages to the same purpose :—

What is the meaning of a peace party in the loyal States? It is, and can be only a party organized to embarrass the government, and to aid the rebels in gaining their independence. It is a disloyal party, and organized with a traitorous intent If the government did its duty . . . the base wretches who are betraying their country to the rebels would be hung up by the neck and their bodies given to the surgeons. Vile miscreants! miserable cowards! who would look on approvingly, applaudingly, and see their own mother strangled and lend a hand at need; and these are to be treated as high-minded and honourable men; and must freedom shriek if they are punished? What is the use of sending our fathers, husbands, brothers, sons, to sicken and die in the swamps of Virginia or Mississippi, if we suffer these base wretches in our very midst to call conventions, or public meetings, for the very purpose of aiding and abetting the rebellion—to vent publicly their treason, in incendiary speeches and incendiary journals, unchanged, nay undisturbed. It is pusillanimity, it is weakness, it is stupidity, it is rank injustice. Seize half a dozen of the ringleaders, of the real chiefs of the party, try them summarily, and instantly shoot or hang them, and there will be an end of treason in the loyal States; the "peace party" will dissolve as the morning mist before the rising sun, and the whole population of the loyal States will be unanimous in the vigorous prosecution of the war till the rebellion is put down.

Our readers must trust to our assurance that the whole context of the passage (if we had room for it) proves that the "traitors" whom Dr. Brownson calls on the government summarily to shoot or hang, are not men in communication with the enemy, or in any way betraying their country, but merely politicians who express in a legal and constitutional

manner, in Congress or elsewhere, their deliberate opinion in favour of peace. The passage is worthy of Robespierre or Marat. Thank God, the English character and English institutions are still too strong in the United States to make possible the hideous crimes for which it clamours. But we may say of this, as we said before of the language of the Southern vice-president, it shows the real feeling of the people. They are fighting desperately for the restoration of the Union, not for the abolition of slavery.

But the Almighty Ruler of the world knows how to effect His own purposes by means of the passions, and even of the crimes, of men; and this dreadful war, provoked by the South for the extension of slavery and the slave-trade, and accepted by the North for the restoration of the Union, promises to be His instrument for putting an end to the system of negro slavery as it has hitherto prevailed in the American States,—a system which we must deliberately pronounce to be one of the foulest evils, moral and physical, that the world has ever known. We may hereafter enter more into the particulars of the means by which this has been, and is being effected. Our space allows us at present only to mention shortly two or three of the leading facts which seem to point out what appears to us to be the most probable course of events.

The government of the United States has offered compensation, to a certain amount, to States which choose to emancipate their slaves by their own act. This offer has been formally accepted by the State of Missouri. But it is rather to the existing feeling on the part of the government of which it gives proof that we desire to call attention.

Slavery has been abolished by law in the territory of Columbia, which contained 385 slaves, besides the great numbers brought into it by Southern masters attending Congress, and the like; and compensation has been voted for them.

A treaty has for the first time been made with England, by which a mutual right of search has been conceded to the ships of both nations for the suppression of the slave-trade.

A slave-trading captain has been tried, condemned, and hanged for piracy, in New York. He richly deserved his doom. But it seems to us that the government which, for its own purposes, had connived at the iniquitous trade for fifty years after it was declared piracy, ought to have given some public notice that the law would henceforth be carried out, before it was put in force against an individual, however guilty. Be this as it may, no future slave-trader can now say that he has not had most intelligible notice that the law is henceforth to be executed.

The negro republics of Hayti and Liberia have been recognized by the United States.

Finally, Mr. Lincoln has declared all slaves belonging to "rebels" free. This he claims power to do, not as president, but as commander-in-chief of the armies of the Union, and therefore, it is maintained by his partisans, competent to do anything which in his own opinion is necessary as a war measure. It is clear that if the fact of the war really gave the President power thus to legislate, not merely for the camps and garrisons of the army, but for districts many hundred miles distant from any military force, the President would be more absolute, as long as the war lasts, than the Czar himself. We are not maintaining that this measure was lawful. If law were in possession, we cannot doubt that it would at once be quashed. But, in every slave-holding district occupied by the armies of the United States, it has been carried out. It is now stated that of the four million of slaves whom the Southern States contained when the secession took place, more than one million have already been freed, the survivors of whom are either working for wages or serving in the army.

This last is perhaps the greatest change of all. Black regiments have been formed, and have been treated as the equals of those composed of whites. Everywhere they have greatly distinguished themselves. Mr. Lincoln's last message says that there are now one hundred thousand negroes in arms for the Union.

What may be the result of this war it is hard to say. All men must feel that a country of extent so enormous, if really determined to resist to the last, cannot possibly be conquered. Moreover, the Southern States have shown a surprising degree of military virtue and resolute perseverance, while in military skill they have altogether distanced their foes. That foe, however, has terrible advantages. To say nothing of the great preponderance of numbers on the side of the North; of the still greater superiority in wealth, and all the resources of war; of the absolute command both of the sea and every river large enough to float a gunboat, the North has a still greater advantage in that its armies, whenever they appear in the Slave States, at once draw to them the whole labouring class of the invaded districts. It would be most rash to make any prediction with regard to a country the internal state of which we know so little; but it would seem that if the North obstinately maintains its resolution to carry on the war until the whole Southern country is conquered, successful resistance can ultimately be made only by setting free the negro population and enlisting it in defence of the South,

as is already done by the invaders. This, of course, implies the final and permanent abolition of slavery. But it is equally implied if the North should effect its purpose of conquest. It has already been proved by experience in several of the States; that the slaves of two years ago work so much better for wages than they ever worked under the lash, that the actual net profits of the plantations, after wages have been deducted, are greater than they were when no wages were paid. Already some are working on land bought by negroes who were slaves only two years ago, and who have clubbed together, for the purchase, the wages of their first year as free labourers.

Under such a state of things we can hardly entertain a doubt that, let the war end as it may, North American slavery is a thing of the past; and we heartily thank God for it. Grievous as have been the evils of this war, such a result, if it be obtained, would soon repay them tenfold to the Southern States themselves, to the Union, to the whole world. For our part, we must confess that we have been inclined to fear that the American negroes would be the greatest of all sufferers from the war; that, in fact, they could hardly escape destruction in the fierce collision of the dominant and stronger race. Our fears are not wholly removed; but the late accounts are very hopeful, and we are now inclined to believe that the close of this war, whenever it comes, may find certain large districts least suited to be cultivated by white men and best suited to the negro constitution, practically abandoned to them. This might gradually lead to a negro emigration from other parts of the United States into these districts; and thus, as there have already been German districts in the State of Pennsylvania, there might hereafter be negro districts farther south. We hope, also, that when colour shall cease to be a badge of slavery, the coloured race may be admitted to the rights of humanity even in the North. But, we repeat it, these are mere speculations as to the future. Our hopes are still mingled with many fears, which result from the extreme intensity of the prejudice prevailing on this subject in the American States, even more than from the difficulty of training to habits of willing industry a race so long degraded and corrupted by the system of slavery to which they have been subjected.

As Catholics, we must never shrink from bearing our testimony that slavery, such as it has hitherto been in the American States, is utterly hateful. We have seen with considerable anxiety a tendency in English society to abate something from that horror of it which has so long charac-

terized us. The change, indeed, is most natural. Our sympathy could not fail to be excited, when a body of men of our own blood were standing gallantly at bay against odds so overwhelming as those which the Southern States have confronted for more than two years. The men of the North, too, have, as we have already said, laboriously done all that they could to alienate it from themselves. Moreover, of their sayings and doings we have both seen and heard much, while of their opponents we have really seen only their gallant deeds of arms. It was abundantly apparent that they were not fighting against slavery, and Englishmen, therefore, naturally enough concluded that their opponents were not fighting for it. Hence, in ranking themselves on one side or the other, slavery has gradually slipped out of men's minds and been well-nigh forgotten. Let it, then, be repeated—to identify ourselves with the seceders is, however unconsciously, not only to advocate the perpetuation and extension of slavery, but to aid in the restoration and immense development of the slave-trade, a thing utterly abhorrent to all the principles of the Catholic Church; hateful and accursed of God and man.

Let us not deceive ourselves with sophistry like that of Mr. Carlyle, as if the difference between slave and free labour, as the two systems exist in the American States, were merely one of words and names. That there is, especially in countries long fully peopled, a miserable amount of degradation and suffering among the labouring classes, we deeply and sorrowfully feel. That there have been very many, and that there are still some, laws and institutions in this or that Christian land which tend to perpetuate and increase that misery, is true. Much has already been done, and still more remains to be done, to prevent whatever part of these evils can be prevented, and to alleviate what cannot. After all, however, it is true that the relation of rich and poor, employer and labourer, is a relation established by the Providence of God; and the miseries with which it has been infected, whether by the sins, or blunders, or infirmities of man, are no more argument against it than the many miseries which taint family life are an argument against God's ordinance of marriage. American slavery is absolutely the opposite in its origin and character, as well as in its effects. No need at present to inquire whether what is called slavery, as it prevailed in the tents of our father Abraham, bore any resemblance to the slavery of commercial nations in modern times, in which the slave is of a race strongly marked off from that of the master. It is of this last that we are speaking. And of this we say, that it is so absolutely contrary to the whole spirit of Christianity, that the attempt to blend the two

in harmony is to mix oil and vinegar. Mix them as you will, they will separate by the force of their own nature; and either Christianity will banish slavery, or slavery will banish Christianity. The Church in the earliest ages was sent to conquer a world in which slavery was universal. From the first it modified the relation. Conquering and to conquer it went on, and M. Cochin traces, in his seventh book, the prodigious change which it had already effected before the Roman empire broke up. Then all had to be begun again. Every European country was occupied by hordes of barbarians, among each of which slavery was an established institution. But in this case the leaven was from the first included in the mass. Trodden down and oppressed as was the religion of the conquered race, the Church was still living, and from the first day it began to spread through the vast overlying mass of heathen superstitions, customs, maxims, and institutions. And not more surely did it destroy idolatry itself than it undermined slavery, and many other parts of the ancient edifice of society, which it could not at once, and at a blow, overthrow. Years passed away, and great changes were already introduced. Multitudes of slaves had been freed; the condition of the rest had gradually been modified. From being the conqueror's spoil they had become serfs, *adscripti glebe*. Another age passed, and not so much as a serf was to be found—the leaven had pervaded the whole mass; Christ had conquered and was King, and slavery had disappeared.

But with the stimulus given to the European mind at the close of the fifteenth and the beginning of the sixteenth centuries, a new system of slavery was introduced. M. Cochin traces its origin and growth. It is essential to observe that it had its source in the African slave-trade, and was prodigiously developed by the discovery of America. Both these events mark the very end of the fifteenth century; and it was in 1517 that the great falling away of the Western nations began under the influence of Martin Luther. The Church was still the same, and her principles unchanged, but her power in the world was incalculably shaken; and while Europe was contending with weapons material as well as spiritual and intellectual, whether Catholic truth or heresy was to prevail, the slave-trade and slavery struck deep their deadly roots into the soil of two great continents. It is well worthy of notice that Pope Pius II. protested against the new system of slavery from its very origin. Had the ancient influence of the Holy See continued unchanged, this great evil could never have been consummated. We are therefore justified in pronouncing that American slavery, as it exists,

is the legitimate offspring of Protestantism. The Protestant Reformers, like other agents of ill, are the authors of evils and miseries of which they never thought, and (in this world) never heard. Negro slavery, indeed, has existed in Catholic colonies; but the whole influence of the Church has always been at work against it—has from the very first greatly modified it—and has already rooted it out of the soil of most of them. In a Protestant country alone could such a system have prevailed as that which but two years ago was in absolute possession in the Southern States of the American Union. And not only has the Church thus acted upon slavery, but it is important to observe that it has in the strongest manner condemned the slave-trade, without which the modern system never could have arisen, and which the instinct of the Southern slaveholders has taught them is really necessary to its permanent maintenance. To condemn the slave-trade as utterly and radically unlawful and sinful from first to last, is in fact to condemn that without which American slavery could never have existed, and the continuance or restoration of which, in one form or another, is a condition *sine quâ non* of its permanent existence. Now it is undoubtedly true that slavery, *per se*, has not been condemned by the Church as a thing in itself, and under all circumstances, intolerable. Nay, the proposition that it is so has been censured; and hence some have inferred that it is more or less presumptuous to condemn, in terms such as we have deliberately used, slavery as it exists in the American States. Not so, however; for say what we may of the ancient patriarchal systems of Arabia and Syria, that which we denounce has virtually been condemned by the Church in repeated solemn acts, in the strongest possible language, and under the most awful penalties which she can impose. For it is inseparable, in the long run, from the African slave-trade in which it had its origin; and the slave-trade has over and over again been condemned and denounced by many successive Popes. No man who has any thing to do, directly or indirectly, with the slave-trade, has any pretence for calling himself a good Catholic. Here, again, the evidence collected by M. Cochin is most valuable and important. In his Appendix he gives at length the Bulls of Benedict XIV. in 1741, and of Gregory XVI. in 1839; a glorious and ever-memorable testimony to the teaching and practice of the Catholic Church. It is well worthy of notice that Gregory XVI., appealing, according to the custom of the Church, to the acts and declarations of preceding Popes, begins by quoting the words of him whom he describes as “an apostolic man, our predecessor Clement I., of most holy memory.” This is none other than

the companion of S. Paul, to whom the Apostle bears testimony that "his name is in the Book of Life." Yes, such is the testimony borne by the Church from the times of the Apostles to our own—holy Pontiffs have witnessed not only to the Death, Resurrection, and Triumph of their Incarnate Lord, but to His union with the poorest and most oppressed of the members of His mystical Body, and therefore to the dignity and rights of redeemed humanity. We may add, for the consideration of all who desire (in the words of S. Ignatius) to sympathize with the mind and spirit of Holy Church, that these Bulls pronounce excommunication *ipso facto*—irremovable except in *articulo mortis*, or by the Pope himself—not only against "all who illtreat Indians, negroes, or any other men"—who "reduce them to slavery, sell them, buy them, exchange them, give them away, separate them from their wives and children, transport them from one place or country to another, and, in a word, in any way whatever deprive them of their liberty"—but also against "*all who in any way support or encourage those who do any of these things, or authorize them either by teaching or preaching, or contribute towards them under any pretext whatever, whether by advice, protection, assistance, or any other manner of co-operation.*" It seems, then, that Catholics, even in England, may, if they do not take care, incur the censures of the Church by co-operation with the crimes of American slavery. We have seen how the Americans of the Free States have, for temporal interests, made themselves sharers in the guilt. May not the evils which the present horrible and fratricidal civil war has brought on both parties be the judgment of God upon them for their crime?

We have no space to enlarge on the true nature of American slavery. We will not be led into the discussion whether acts of cruelty are common. It would hardly make any appreciable difference in our feelings, even if it could be proved (as all men admit it cannot) that such things never happen. Even if it produced no cruelty and no physical misery, American slavery would still be an incalculable evil, a deadly poison, economical, social, and moral—a cancer eating away the temporal and spiritual good both of masters and slaves, and of the country which is cursed with it. Above all, its moral aspects are so utterly horrible and revolting, that they are protected from examination and exposure by their unutterable foulness. Among the original habitants of the prairies was a quadruped which no hunter dared to touch, because when wounded it sends forth a stench too loathsome for human endurance. Such, we must needs say, is the system which the Anglo-

Saxon race is labouring to introduce into the lands from which the beast itself is gradually being driven. We shrink from touching it. Those who know anything of the facts will not accuse us of speaking too strongly.

Our conclusion is, that we do not desire the Northern States to effect what they desire—to conquer the South and restore the Union. Natural as it is that they should desire it, we are sure that the division of the North American States into two separate powers is better for themselves, for America, and for the world at large. Above all, it is plain that, if the subjugation of the South had really been accomplished within the “ninety days” in which Mr. Seward promised to effect it, slavery would have passed through the shock unshaken. Of all calamities, the restoration of the Union on the old terms would surely have been the greatest. Frightful, indeed, have already been the evils of the civil war. More frightful still may be those it will yet entail. Every Christian must surely respond to the earnest and touching appeal of the Holy Father in his letter to the Archbishops of New York and New Orleans, and do all he can, by his influence, by his exertions, and, if in no other way, by his prayers, to bring it to a speedy end. God grant he may see his yearnings after peace soon gratified. And yet we cannot doubt that the fatherly heart of Pius IX. must feel that, dreadful as have been the evils of the war, yet if (as there now seem strong grounds to hope) it shall have rid the earth for ever of the slave system which so lately existed in the American States, never will the miseries of any war have been so fully and so richly repaid.

ART. IV.—THE LAUREATE AND HIS SCHOOL.

1. *Poems*. By ALFRED TENNYSON. Tenth edition. London: Moxon.
 2. *The Princess; a Medley. Idylls of the King*. By ALFRED TENNYSON. London: Moxon.
 3. *Tannhäuser; or, the Battle of the Bards*. A Poem. By NEVILLE TEMPLE and EDWARD TREVOR. London: Chapman.
 4. *Poems*. By JEAN INGELow. London: Longman.
- The Quest of the Sangraal*. By R. S. HAWKER, Vicar of Morwenstow. Oxford: Godwin.

THE mind of the age is best reflected in the literature of the age. When Lord Macaulay's New Zealander studies in its ruins the strength of this Empire, he may read in our works of science, or in our newspapers (if any be preserved), the records of what we *did*; but the poems of the Laureate will show him what we *were*. In some sense it may be said that what Horace was to the Augustan Age, what Shakespeare was to the Elizabethan age, what Pope and Addison were to the eighteenth century, Tennyson is to the present times. That niceness and fastidiousness of style—which cannot afford the alteration of a single word—where everything is said in the neatest and tersest manner—where even the least important words are chosen with a view to euphony, and graces of diction and effects of colouring are prominent in every line—will indicate an epoch in our literature when the refinements of writing were carried to excess. The exquisite beauty of the poet's models; the frenzy of his feelings; his aspirations and discontents; his complaints against the hard, matter-of-fact age in which his lot is cast; the secret pride and pleasure he takes, notwithstanding, in the triumphs of its inventiveness; the delicate sensitiveness of his taste, which, while it shrinks from all that is coarse, is not wholly free from sensuousness; his sympathy with much of the Christian spirit, but indifference about Christian dogma, and his *know-nothing* philosophy, will give our enlightened visitor a pretty correct notion of the culture, sentiments, and intellectual tendencies of English gentlemen in the reign of Queen Victoria. A philosopher of the school of Mr. Buckle would tell us that such a poet as the Laureate is a necessary creation of the present epoch of English civilization: given the conditions, the epoch must have created him. Be this as it may, the study of such a phenomenon ought to be an object of interest, even to those

who have no attraction to poetry for its own sake ; for, as we have just indicated, besides the æsthetical, an historical and political interest attaches to the present Laureate and his school.

There is no little difficulty in criticizing a living celebrity. His genius so dazzles his admirers that they will be impatient of the least word which may seem to detract in the slightest degree from his merits ; while praise, however qualified, will be equally distasteful to that considerable class of persons who by age, or by taste and feeling, belong to a past generation, and who are slow to throw themselves into new spheres and modes of thought. The former will remind you that you are behind the age ; that the capacity of appreciating Tennyson might almost enter into the definition of a thoroughly educated English gentleman : the latter will revert, with a sigh of regret, to the old standard writers, such as Dryden and Pope, whose works are now so sadly neglected ; nay, Scott and even Byron find some favour in their eyes ; but with the enthusiasm inspired by Tennyson they are not in harmony. This consideration it is which chiefly induces us to take the standing-point of our New Zealander, and, forgetting what the world actually thinks, to inquire rather what the world will think upon the subject when the present age has become "part and parcel of the dreadful past ;" and what estimate the future world will form of a writer, we may infer with tolerable confidence from learning how it has fared with writers who have gone before and set the fashion in their day ; remembering that noble sentiment of Cicero which Dr. Johnson has embalmed in his sonorous language, that "time effaces the fictions of opinion and confirms the determinations of nature."

This sentiment will already have prepared the reader for our judgment on Mr. Tennyson's poetry. It would argue in us a want of appreciation of true poetic genius, not to say ingratitude for the many hours' delight he has afforded us, to withhold from him our tribute of praise ; but our difference with the vast number of his admirers is just this, that we are unable to commend him for those very mannerisms which give him, in their eyes, his chief claim to admiration, and which, because it is the easiest thing in the world to imitate them, threaten us (Heaven forbid !) with a plague of poetasters. The sing-song of alliteration and the see-saw of repetition have for us small charms : what are they but provocatives of fun and parody at times of social relaxation ? Neither do we admire the spirit which is infused into many of his poems ; and we are cold on the subject of *word-painting*—a manner of writing which originated with Keats, but has now become almost identified with

the Laureate's style. If these are the sort of qualities which must be appreciated under pain of being accounted deficient in taste, we must submit to our fate; comforting ourselves with the assurance that the fashion of the world passeth—for what is it but a fashion? It was once the fashion to *parley euphuism*, a sort of language which, one would think, neither gods nor men could have endured. Almost all Shakespeare's courtiers and fine gentlemen—even his heroes when they unbend to gossip—talk in the language of Lily; but when they become grave again, or when they are roused by sudden passion, Dame Nature reasserts her claims, and they relapse into their mother tongue. Dryden started on his poetical career in a style crammed with the conceits that Donne and Cowley had rendered fashionable. The death of a young nobleman, Lord Hastings, by small-pox, was the subject of his earliest production. The pustules are first jewels, then rosebuds “with the lily skin about,” each little pimple weeping a tear; then they become *stars*, and at last a *constellation*! So far may fashion lead genius away from nature. Dryden soon forsook the manner of Donne, and, no doubt, grew heartily ashamed of his youthful eruption; and Tennyson, or we much mistake, has learned to pass fitting judgment on the manner of his earlier pieces. Anyone who has met with the first edition of his poems (now so rare), which was published in 1830, and has compared it with the later editions, will see how carefully the poet has weeded his pretty garden. It would be unfair (save that the Laureate can so well bear it) to remember now the answer to Christopher North's criticism in *Maga*, who is first *crusty* Christopher, then *rusty* Christopher, then *musty* Christopher, and at last *fusty* Christopher! We have mentioned Dryden's first effort advisedly, for he reminds us that one of Tennyson's mannerisms is not new, though, of course, we are far from insinuating that a writer who possesses so many resources of his own has needed to become a borrower. Still, we cannot help hazarding the opinion, that had some of Dryden's lyrics—such, for instance, as the “Death of Damon,” or the “Rondelay of Chloe and Amyntas,”—been bound up with Tennyson's earlier effusions, only those who were familiar with Dryden's works would have detected the imposition. But here the comparison ceases. Tennyson, though he may excel Dryden in pathos and in the delicacy of his fancy, and though he is so great a master in the art of versification, does not match the natural ease and gracefulness, or the high-sounding music that charms us in many of Dryden's lines. Again, though both evince a fondness for the ancient models, yet Tennyson's genius is too ambitious to suffer him to be a

close copyist, or an extensive translator, such as was Dryden, though of the highest excellence. In another respect their literary paths have been divergent: Dryden became the great satirical writer of his day, while Tennyson has only shown in such poems as "Locksley Hall" and "Clara Vere de Vere," that he lacks not the quality, though his tastes lead him into other departments of his art.

It is only doing the Laureate justice to observe that, unlike most of his admirers, he does not make the essence of poetry to consist in *manner*. The very fact that he has written in several distinct manners, rather tends to show that he thinks the poetry one thing and the manner another. The "Princess," the "Morte d'Arthur," the "Lotos Eaters," are specially Tennysonian; but "Dora," "Ulysses," the Ballads, and, perhaps, "Godiva," are in another style, and have in them nothing of word-painting in the technical sense of that term. The consequence is obvious: either these latter are not poems, or word-painting is not of the essence of poetry. It is not indeed poetry: it is only the fashionable dress which poetry wears at this time, and which, no doubt, in its turn will go out of fashion. It may be presumed that the time will come when such expressions as "drops of onset," "tingling stars," or the "springing East," will be reckoned amongst the curiosities of literature; when such passages as "Large Hesper glittered on her tears," "How may full-sailed verse express?" "Down deepening from swoon to swoon," and others, will be regarded as affectations which none will venture to imitate. People wonder at the strange fantastical combinations which are found in the poets between Shakespeare and Milton; but what will our great-grandchildren think of some of Fatima's ravings; as, for instance:—

And isled in sudden seas of light,
My heart, pierced through with fierce delight,
Bursts into blossom in his sight.

Now it would be unfair to single out such faults and blotches were they less numerous, and did they not lead to consequences worse than themselves—the arbitrary coining of words like "vary-coloured," "engarlanded," "dew-impearled," "subtle-thoughted," "myriad-minded," "willow-veiled" &c.; the changing of a noun into a verb; as winds that "shrill,"* breezes that "dusk;" and occasional obscurities. But we instance them rather as proofs of the radical defect of the

* There is, however, an ancient verb, *to shrill*, used in the oldest English poets.

word-painting theory,* which is an excessive elaboration of the details to the injury of the conception as a whole. The colouring matter is laid thick on almost every word; but the result resembles a piece of mosaic-work rather than a picture. Here the poet seems to make the same sort of mistake as a painter who should paint every separate leaf of the tree, whereas we do not see every separate leaf; and thus a truer impression is produced when things are painted as they appear, and not as they are. We observe the same kind of fault in the flow of the verse. Every little word, we have said, is chosen with a view to euphony, and yet there is a certain hardness in the lines: we miss the smooth, musical cadences of Milton's verses or Pope's.

The chief result of over-working the several details, is that artificial character which is stamped on most of Mr. Tennyson's poems, and which seldom suffers us to forget that we are reading a composition, and a composition of the most curiously careful, the most fastidious, the most dainty of composers. There is such a cunning in the choice and disposal of the words, such a sleight-of-hand and witchery in the expressions and conceits, that we might almost apply to Tennyson the words of Sir Henry Blount about Lily the Euphuist, that, "our nation is indebted to him for a new English that he has taught them." Hence, this sort of poetry has no charms for ordinary people—they cannot comprehend it. But is not this the fault of the poetry and not of the people? Scott tried his "Lady of the Lake" on a farmer, and was successful: the farmer took it all in. Molière proved his jokes (so the story goes) upon a cross-grained cook; and the witticism which did not get a laugh out of her was cancelled. We once saw a Neapolitan reciting Tasso's "*Gerusalemme Liberata*" to a ragged crowd on the Chiaja, who gave the man coppers. How would Tennyson's "*Morte d'Arthur*" be received by an audience of navvies and coal-heavers? Would it be listened to—save, perhaps, with the stupid, open-mouthed wonder of the miller's daughter listening to the eloquence of Piercie

* Possibly the real origin of the eccentricity which has received the name of word-painting, is to be sought in the way in which our moderns regard nature. Our old poets went to nature for their illustrations; our moderns worship nature itself, and derive their inspirations and subjective notions from it. This tendency has had its almost pantheistic manifestations; and even a great poet of our day to whom we are perhaps more largely indebted than to any other for a healthy reform in taste and feeling—William Wordsworth—has laid himself open to this serious charge, although, as we hardly need observe, he is free from those exaggerated prettinesses—so foreign to the truthfulness and sobriety of his imagination—in which the naturalistic turn of mind now displays itself.

Shafton? It will be urged that the comparison is unfair, as in that land of song the most ignorant peasant has a soul more attuned to poetry than has the working artisan in our northern clime, let alone our navvies and coal-heavers; and the objection is true to a certain extent. Still, what we have here maintained holds good: Tennyson's poetry is not of that lucid character which recommends itself to the uneducated, as distinguished from the cloddish mind. And this, indeed, is not only conceded by his enthusiastic admirers, but is alleged in his defence. It would be unjust, say they, to submit Tennyson to such a test; there is a sort of poetry which requires for its just appreciation a poetical education, as there is a sort of music which addresses itself only to the musically educated. "Read the piece twice or thrice," we have heard it said of the "In Memoriam," "and then the meaning will come out beautifully." We leave the matter to the reader's judgment. Certainly Pope or Goldsmith would have despised this sort of writing. How different their style in this respect! their thoughts shine through their words like pebbles at the bottom of a limpid stream. But of course we should exempt from these strictures such poems as the "Palace of Art," the "Lotos Eaters," and the "Vision of Sin," which must be viewed as allegories.

However, all Tennyson's faults, as far as style is concerned, may be summed up in one word—he is *artificial*. Perhaps a poet of this artificial age must have been artificial. The prose writers are the same, for the most part. It is not that they want a kind of simplicity: they know the value of the quality well; but their very simplicity is affected—artificial. They are not simple as Bunyan was simple, or Defoe, or Goldsmith. These were simple indeed; but the writers of our day put on simplicity—that is the difference. If, as Burke said, "It is the nature of all greatness not to be exact," it will fare ill with Tennyson, for never was author more exact. Look at the "Morte d'Arthur," the "Princess," the "Idylls." You need not read far: any one sentence is a study of exactness. See if you can find anywhere a more telling word, or a more telling way of putting it. What labour has been employed everywhere in hunting out the very phrase, giving it the neatest turn, and putting the finest polish on it! Poetry is indeed an art, and the Laureate the most exquisite of artists: but then the art should be concealed.

And now, we believe, we have said almost all that the most ill-natured critic could say on the subject of this poet's style. But when we take up his works we do not, we cannot, read to criticise. There is a charm in every genuine poet which

disarms criticism. We become intoxicated, inspired with the spirit of the writer. This is the case even when we are reading Shelley or Poe, for whose mannerisms we have the same sort of dislike as for Tennyson's: but it is especially the case with Tennyson himself. We see the inmost depths of his soul; we look into nature with his eyes; we read what we have often vaguely felt now uttered in words which engrave themselves spontaneously on the memory. We are no longer offended by the mannerisms which at first somewhat startled and annoyed us. We love them (save when imitated by poetasters) as the language in which the dear, familiar spirit holds communion with our spirit. Besides, they are now natural in him; they have become, that is to say, a second nature to him. No wonder that admirers should come to identify them with the essence of poetry: thus might some devotee take up the peculiar devotion or practice of a beloved saint, and identify it with sanctity itself. But as we must distinguish what is of the essence of sanctity from the peculiar practices in which it may manifest itself, so must we carefully separate in our minds what constitutes true poetry from the style or idiosyncrasy of the poet. M. Cousin's treatise "*Du Beau*" ought to be read by every one who wishes to have sound æsthetical views; but we know of no English writer who has treated the poetical department of this vast subject half so ably or beautifully as Mr. Aubrey de Vere, in his Introduction to the "*Selections from the Poets*." "It is the office of poetry," Lord Bacon had said, "to submit the shows of things to the desires of the mind;" "meaning by the mind," Mr. de Vere explains, "the aspirations of that *mens melior*, or nobler mind, which is the part of man that retains the image of God and thirsts for immortality. The world of sense, since the Fall, has lost the glory of that light which dwelt upon its countenance, as it was first created. In poetry a portion of that light is restored; for poetry is an ideal art, which invests objects with a grandeur, a freedom, and a purity not their own. When we speak of 'poetic Justice,' we refer to the fact that in poetry we require a justice more palpable and swift than that which the eye discerns in the course of actual events. When we speak of poetic Truth, we refer to a truth essential and universal, and free from the accidents to which the detail of common things is, in appearance at least, subjected. Not less sacred is that Beauty of which the poets in every age have sung. It is nothing merely material, although it manifests itself in material things. From them it looks forth, as the soul looks forth from the face." We have great pleasure in quoting and endorsing this noble sentiment, which exhibits poetry in its true light:

Poetry is not a mere play of the fancy; nor is its primary office to amuse the mind and while away pleasantly a leisure hour. But it is an art which is engaged about the ideal—that ideal which is our only natural remembrance of the paradise we have lost, our only natural earnest of the paradise to come. Hence that indescribable sentiment which one experiences in reading poetry, as in hearing music. We cannot convey to others any clear notion of the manner in which we are affected. Poetry, like Music, is the daughter of Heaven, and ought to lead us nearer to Heaven, and nearer to God. It is its office—Mr. de Vere has said it—to unsensualize the world of sense, by breathing into it somewhat of our own immortal spirit.

But since this is our notion of poetry, what higher praise can we bestow on our author than to say that he is a genuine poet? For the sake of this one word, let his admirers bear with the mention of his faults. Whatever he says, and however he says it, the thought is redolent of the rare gift that is in him: this is a quality which redeems everything. His poetry does not pass from us when we close the book; it leaves a sweet taste in the mouth; it becomes a part of our own mind. What better proof can we have that it is genuine poetry? Whether he describes that sweet little brook that flows by Philip's farm, with its frolicsome trout, and skimming swallows, and pretty blue forget-me-nots; or, the road that runs by Camelot, with the curly shepherd-lad, and the abbot on his ambling mule, with the fields of barley and of rye on either side; or that "great water" where the black-draped barge came and bore the dying Arthur to the land of Avillion; or the eagle sitting with "hooked hands" on his mountain-walls—whether he sings of the dreamy swoon-land of the "lotos eaters," where it is "always afternoon," or of the noble Godiva who rides "clothed on with chastity"—the image is indelible, because through it the poet has awakened that ideal which God has set in our hearts, and which lends to earthly objects a glory as from heaven. The brook which he paints answers to a sunny brook of our dreams; the summer morning's walk on the Camelot road, the "wrinkled" sea, the shining levels of the lake—are they not somewhere painted in hues of heaven, within the secret chambers of the soul? Do we not bear within us the image of a world whereof the glory has not passed, which sin and sorrow have not polluted? This is no dim reminiscence of anything we have known, no half-withered record of experience. We have never seen, nor shall see, scenes so fair: not even do the poet's words, with all the various appliances of his art, duly paint them as they are; he merely suggests them to our spirit. No! it is the spirit itself, or something divine

within the spirit, which through the instrumentality of his weak words exhibits these ideals to the mind's gaze.

But although poetry be so sublime, so almost divine an art, it does not follow that the poet need be a religiously-minded man. Not even the fallen spirits, according to S. Thomas Aquinas, have lost, through their fall, aught of that natural light which contemplates the Good, the True, and the Beautiful; they have lost, indeed, the *love* of the good, the true, and the beautiful, but they have not lost the *perception* of it: they could not have lost it and remain intelligent beings. But poetry needs the savour of divine grace, if it is to lead us to God—nay, if it is perfectly to fulfil its highest function of unsensualizing the objects of sense.

Sine Tuo numine
Nihil est in homine,
Nihil est innoxium.

Speaking on this subject, we are reminded how much the Laureate loses by being a Protestant; though we gladly mention one happy feature in the religious element of his poetry—his sympathy with the Christian spirit. As far as dogma is concerned, we are painfully conscious of his want of it; but his sublime appreciation of the power of prayer in the "*Morte d'Arthur*," and of the virtue of chastity in "*Guinevere*," ought not to be passed over in silence. Would that this richly-gifted mind were able to perceive that there is one religion appointed by God to teach us both what we are to believe and what we are to do in order to Eternal Life; that it is inconsistent to embrace one half of Christianity and overlook the other; to reverence chastity and prayer, and to have no higher consolation when friends are removed than such as an intelligent heathen might have cherished. How would the sweet melancholy of the "*In Memoriam*" be all the more divinely sweet, if flavoured with the heavenly balm of the "*Communion of Saints*." Then, in another way Mr. Tennyson is a loser by his Protestantism. Like most poets, he is fond of painting Catholic ideals; but one can see, with half an eye, that they are painted by a Protestant. Sir Galahad and S. Agnes are mere pictures, beautifully but coldly drawn. They remind us of some old Gothic paintings of saints, with a scroll of Latin coming from their mouths. But we do not own his S. Simeon Stylites as a Catholic saint. The saint chooses a life of suffering and mortification, that he may resemble his crucified Saviour; that his sufferings, through the merits of that Saviour's sufferings, may atone for his past sins; and that he may be raised by them above the

thralldom of sense and instinct. This is the key to understanding the lives of the Saints. They never boast of their own deeds; they have a deep sense of their nothingness and unworthiness. But Mr. Tennyson's S. Simeon is as proud of his ascetical feats as a yogi or dancing dervish, or one of those hook-swingers, who will go through the exercise for a pecuniary consideration. When, therefore, we say that Tennyson has sympathy with the Christian spirit, we must make a certain reservation. Christianity has not been so long in the world without leavening society with its heavenly doctrine, beyond the sphere of its direct supernatural action. This is true even as respects those who reject its claims. Unbelievers and atheists adopt so much of its teaching as approves itself to their reason, and has been taken up into the general opinion of the world. They live in an atmosphere which has imbibed Christian elements to a certain extent: a remark still more applicable to Protestants, who have retained a portion of Catholic truth and allow the divine claims of the Gospel. With a palpable inconsistency, as we have just observed, they reject a large portion of that which possesses the same divine sanction as the portion which they accept. Nay, they assail the rejected with the help of the accepted portion. Thus they make use of the loving precepts of the Gospel to banish its ascetic and crucifying maxims. It is still the scandal of the Cross—that stumbling-block to man's natural reason, blinded by the self-love of his heart. Christianity becomes with them a mere system of ethics, having a divine promulgator. In the mortification of the flesh they see but so much pure suffering, which cannot be acceptable to a merciful and loving Creator, such as the Gospel has made known to us. Nay, did not Christ suffer precisely that we might be saved suffering? Of course, the sufferings of the God-man must encounter the same difficulties, and many more besides; but Protestants are not given to meditation on the mysteries. Religion, like poetry, is with them eminently subjective. We cannot wonder, then, that they find the self-inflicted pains of holy men unpalatable, and even revolting. It is necessary to be brought into more immediate relation with the Heart of Jesus and the Sacraments of His love, in order to know and understand its power. Another consequence of this defective Christianity is the divinisation of the human affections so common among Protestants, and so strongly exemplified in the works of Tennyson. To these affections, and specially to that which has appropriated to itself the name of love, he and others of his school seem to attribute a kind of sacramental and regenerating influence,

We may refer, for a striking example, to a passage in the "Princess." All this proceeds from the same cause which leads to the repugnance felt to the Cross of Christ in its practical bearings—a non-realization of that higher love of which the human is but the earthly type.

Such being the incapacity of Protestants to handle Catholic subjects, we are not sorry, although somewhat surprised, that the "Quest of the San Grail" is not treated by our poet. There is yet an "Idyl* of the King," or rather an epic of unearthly beauty, to be written, and which none but a Catholic could write as it should be written. Glad should we be to hail a religious poem which would not give the reader a fit of the cold shivers. For there is a sort of feeling vaguely expressed in our Protestant literature, that a real saint would not have *character* enough for a hero. A man in whom grace is thoroughly victorious over nature, is supposed to be a cold-blooded, unimpassioned creature, void of all artistic interest. This mischievous notion is rather countenanced in the "Idylls of the King." Arthur is accused by the shameless Vivien as being wanting in character, and the same objection is put into the mouth of Guinevere and never, we think, satisfactorily answered :—

He is all fault, who hath no fault at all ;
For who loves me must have a touch of earth :
The low sun makes the colour.

Nor does the scene in which the guilty wife and injured husband meet for the last time, nor the Queen's tardy discovery of Arthur's merit, quite do away with the awkward impression :—

I thought I could not breathe in that fine air—
That pure severity of perfect light :
I wanted *warmth* and *colour*, which I found
In Lancelot—now I see thee what thou art ;
Thou art the highest, and most human, too,
Not Lancelot, nor another.

But this reparation comes quite too late. We may admire, but we cannot sympathise with, a hero who only then proves human, when provoked by the last of outrages. If this be Arthur, guilty as it was, we can quite understand the Queen's preference for Lancelot. But there is not the faintest show of truth in the allegation that holiness quenches character, or that there is no other human love than the blinding senti-

* The proper orthography of this word is, we believe, the one adopted in the text ; but Mr. Tennyson spells it with the final consonant doubled.

mental passion which ought to go by another name. S. Paul is a striking instance that grace does not annihilate nature. We should like to see in Sir Galahad holiness made charming, as it really is, and the fervour of nature exhibited without its corruption; but the "Quest of the San Grail" is a Catholic subject, and ought to be handled by one who is familiar with Catholic habits of thought, and could use effectually the imposing machinery of the Catholic religion. And it is no exaggeration to say, that of these the English Protestant, so well informed as to other matters, knows about as much as the illustrators of the Christmas-present edition of Tennyson's Poems, where Sir Galahad is represented in the print as half-priest, half-knight, performing a mongrel rite, something between saying Mass and making a chemical analysis. Perhaps the knight confused the San Grail with the philosopher's stone; or perhaps he is saying that "*evening mass*" which puzzles the Catholic readers of Shakespeare and of Sir Walter Scott.*

However, while engaged upon the present paper, we have become aware of the publication of a "First Chant of the Quest of the Sangraal,"† by the Rector of Morwenstow; and it is with unmingled pleasure that we digress awhile from our immediate subject to make the reader acquainted with the merits of this first instalment of an epic poem. Mr. Hawker brings to the task a fine imagination, great vigour of style, a delicate ear, a love of the quaint and antique, and a vast stock of legendary lore. If the reader anticipate, from the nature of

* These writers speak as if it were quite a usual thing to hear Mass in the evening. Shakespeare—considering the rareness of the privilege of hearing Mass in those times of persecution—might easily have been ignorant that Mass was said in the morning; and Sir W. Scott, perhaps, had Shakespeare's expression in mind when he introduces to us the Lady Rowena just come in from her evening Mass, and the Glover and his daughter, in the "Fair Maid of Perth," going to evening Mass on S. Valentine's eve. Perhaps it may interest the reader to know that there was, however, in ancient times, *one* evening Mass, sung at the rise of the first star on Holy Saturday. "Constat enim ex omnibus scriptoribus ecclesiasticis officium missæ, illo sabbato, incœpisse post solis occasum apparente primâ stellâ."—(De Lugo, *De Eucharistia*, disp. xx. sec. 1.)

† Mr. Hawker adopts the Celtic spelling of the word, instead of the Norman, which has been used in these pages. It is compounded of San (*sanctus*) and Graal (*vessel* or *vase*). The San Grail, according to the legend, was the very cup or dish (it seems doubtful which) used by our Lord in the consecration of the elements at the Last Supper. It was brought into this country by S. Joseph of Arimathea; but when evil days came on, and sin tainted the land, the San Grail marvellously disappeared. The quest and final recovery of it under the conduct of Sir Galahad, the mirror of knightly chastity, is the argument of the poem.

the subject, a resemblance to the manner of the "Idylls," which might prove prejudicial to the writer of the "Quest," a perusal of the poem itself would soon dispel the illusion. The individualities of the two writers are not only unlike, but in smart contrast. Mr. Hawker's verse marches along with the enthusiasm of prophecy, while the Laureate's wins upon us by the graces and allurements of art. The former vanquishes by a single blow, the latter by repeated efforts. Not, indeed, that we would institute a comparison as between poet and poet—such a comparison would be unfair to both authors—but as between *manner and manner*. Besides being a genuine poet, Mr. Hawker (though unhappily outside the pale of the Church) is so thoroughly Catholic in his ideas and sentiments, that his success in the treatment of his subject serves but to confirm the general opinion we have expressed above; albeit, at the same time, we cannot but feel that a practical familiarity with the objects of Catholic worship would have materially assisted in the conduct of the poem. It is, moreover, no slight advantage that the work comes to us from Cornwall, King Arthur's own land, and from one of the most favoured spots in that classical region. The tourist will not fail to remark how pregnant are these verses with inspiration drawn from the magnificent cliff-scenery of North Cornwall. We are sorry that our space will only allow some short extracts from King Arthur's speeches, as specimens of Mr. Hawker's powers and manner:—

"And now, fair sirs, your voices : who will gird
His belt for travel in the perilous ways ?
This thing must be fulfill'd : in vain our land
Of noble name, high deeds, and famous men,—
Vain the proud homage of our thrall the sea,—
If we be shorn of God. Ah, loathsome shame !
To hurl in battle for the pride of arms ;
To ride in native tourney, foreign war ;—
To count the stars ; to ponder pictured runes ;
And grasp great knowledge as the demons do—
If we be shorn of God : we must assay
The myth and meaning of this marvellous Bowl :
It shall be sought and found.

* * * * *

Ha ! Sirs—ye seek a noble crest to-day,
To win and wear the starry Sangraal,
The link that binds to God a lonely land.
Would that my arm went with you, like my heart !
But the true shepherd must not shun the fold :
For in this flock are crouching grievous wolves,

And chief amongst them all, my own false kin ;
 Therefore I tarry by the cruel sea,
 To hear at eve the treacherous mermaid's song,
 And watch the wallowing monsters of the wave—
 'Mid all things fierce, and wild, and strange, alone.

* * * * *

Ah ! native Cornwall, throned upon the hills :
 Thy moorland pathways worn by angel-feet,*—
 Thy streams that march in music to the sea,
 'Mid ocean's merry noise, his billowy laugh !
 Ah me ! a gloom falls heavy on my soul ;
 The birds that sung to me in youth are dead :—
 I think in dreamy vigils of the night,
 It may be God is angry with the land—
 Too much athirst for fame, too fond of blood ;
 And all for earth, for shadows, and the dream
 To glean an echo from the winds of song !
 But now let hearts be high ; the archangel held
 A tourney with the fiend on Abarim,
 And good Saint Michael won his dragon-crest.
 Be this our cry !—The battle is for God !
 If beves of foul fiends withstand your path,—
 Nay, if strong angels hold the watch and ward,
 Plunge in their midst and shout, ' A Sangraal ! ' ”

He ceased ; the warriors bent a knightly knee,
 And touch'd, with kiss and sign, Excalibur :
 Then turn'd, and mounted for their perilous way.

There are faults in the poem, no doubt. We observe, for instance, a tendency to repeat the same epithets and expressions. Here and there, too, the phrase is obsolete, and allusions which require glosses and appendices, are too frequent. On the other hand, we hardly observe a fault that could not be easily amended. But when the poem has advanced somewhat further towards its completion, we shall be enabled to form a judgment of it as a whole. Meantime, we heartily recommend it to our readers. To return to our immediate subject.

We have made some statements, which, to those who are but imperfectly acquainted with the Laureate's writings, will sound like contradictions ; but they are contradictions which easily reconcile themselves in the reading. He is the most studious of writers ; and yet a considerable portion of this essay has been occupied with merely verbal criticism. But

* The paths so called by the simple peasantry were worn by pilgrims.

then he is studious, it will be seen, in his very extravagances : even in "Maud," though it seems to have been hit off at random while the poet's fire was at a white heat. He is the Poet of the Age, and yet he is fond of the old themes ; but then the whole current and bent of his mind are modern. He is a true prophet, who knows how to seize, in ancient events and ancient characters, types which the history of the world must always reproduce. He is no pedant in his love of antiquity. He dreams that Arthur is come again ; yet no antiquated model, but a nineteenth-century Arthur, is the subject of his dream :—

There came a bark that, blowing forward, bore
King Arthur, like a modern gentleman
Of stateliest port ; and all the people cried,
" Arthur is come again : he cannot die."

The poem of *Godiva*, again, one of the most beautiful, the most exquisitely finished of his shorter pieces, does not disdain to open thus :—

I waited for the train at Coventry ;
I hung with grooms and porters on the bridge,
To catch the three tall spires ; and there I shaped
The city's ancient legend into this.

"Edwin Morris," "Walking to the Mail," "Audley Court," the "Princess," and others, however, are modern subjects ; and it is remarkable how uniformly superior to circumstances is the Laureate's muse. "Be thou familiar, but by no means vulgar," is a precept which he fulfils to the letter. Here he is especially borne in among the throngs of living men, and called to handle the common matters of daily life which might have been thought incapable of poetical treatment. Not at all ; it was not poetical materials, but a poet, which the age wanted,—and he is the poet of the age. He fears not to speak of coaches and railway trains, of gas-lights and machinery ; he does not call in the aid of euphemisms, or try to screen vulgar incidents under a veil of romantic associations. Conscious that he is a poet, he will call a spade a spade, yet never be prosaic. His is a gift which refines everything it touches, and can make poetry out of anything. His personages rejoice in such unpoetical names as Edwin Morris, Edward Bull, or Everard Hall. He will tell you how he was

tired out
With cutting eights that day upon the pond,
Where, three times slipping from the outward edge,
He bump'd the ice into three several stars ;

or how Limours *punned* ; that is to say, in poetical phraseology, he—

took the word and played upon it,
And made it of two colours.

Not even does he fear to enter into the composition of a game-pie. Thus:—

There, on a slope of orchard, Francis laid
A damask napkin wrought with horse and hound,
Brought out a dusky loaf that smelt of home,
And, half cut down, a pasty costly made,
Where quail and pigeon, lark and leveret lay,
Like fossils of the rock, with golden yolks
Imbedded and injellied ; last, with these,
A flask of cider from his father's vats,
Prime, which I knew.

But it is especially in the “Princess” that Mr. Tennyson has achieved his proudest feat of redeeming a vulgar subject from vulgarity. The *Rights of Women* one would have thought the very last subject a poet should have chosen ; but the result has proved that no subject is, strictly speaking, unpoetical. The “Princess” will bear comparison with the Idyls—if it be not, indeed, the best poem the Laureate has ever written. The Prologue, the “Lady Psyche’s Lecture,” the delicious snatches which the Princess reads from her poetry-book, will furnish as good specimens of the author’s power of treating a thoroughly modern subject as can be found anywhere in his writings. We regard the age of chivalry as an essentially poetical age ; but is not this due to the fact that we view it through the poetical medium of romance ? Will not our own age, spite of money-making and machinery, show just as poetical when viewed through a poetical medium like the “Princess” ? Will not the sports of Sir Walter Vivian’s tenants read to future ages like an Arabian Night ?—

There moved the multitude, a thousand heads :
The patient leaders of their Institute
Taught them with facts. One rear’d a font of stone
And drew, from butts of water on the slope,
The fountain of the moment, playing now
A twisted snake, and now a rain of pearls,
Or steep-up spout whereon the gilded ball
Danced like a wisp ; and, somewhat lower down,
A man with knobs and wires and vials fired
A cannon : Echo answered in her sleep
From hollow fields ; and here were telescopes
For azure views ; and there a group of girls

In circle waited, whom the electric shock
Dislinked with shrieks and laughter : round the lake
A little clockwork steamer paddling plied,
And shook the lilies ; perched about the knolls
A dozen angry models jetted steam ;
A petty railway ran ; a fire-balloon
Rose gem-like up before the dusky groves,
And dropt a fairy parachute and past :
And there through twenty posts of telegraph
They flashed a saucy message to and fro
Between the mimic stations ; so that sport
Went hand in hand with Science ; elsewhere
Pure sport : a herd of boys with clamour bowl'd
And stumped the wicket ; babies rolled about
Like tumbled fruit in grass ; and men and maids
Arranged a country dance, and flew thro' light
And shadow, while the twanging violin
Struck up with Soldier-laddie ; and overhead
The broad ambrosial aisles of lofty lime
Made noise with bees and breeze from end to end.

The writings of Mr. Tennyson, in short, point to the fact that the age of poetry is not past, and that it is not impossible for our own times to produce a first-class poet, even such as Milton or Shakespeare. For though Tennyson is not equal to Milton or to Shakespeare, yet he has the same sort of stuff in him as the dreams of these great ones are made of. Addison did not hesitate to write of Pope's "Essay on Criticism," that it contained passages which, had they been found in one of the celebrated ancient poets, would have been extolled to the skies. We are emboldened to imitate, in regard to the Laureate's poems, this generous liberality. We think, indeed, that it is mere pedantic affectation to deny that there are single passages which would have adorned the writings of Homer or Milton ; such as the simile of—

wild Limours

Borne on a black horse like a thunder-cloud,
Whose skirts are loosened by the breaking storm,

which occurs in the first of the Idyls ; or the description of the rout of that knight and his men, from the same poem :—

But at the flash and motion of the man,
They vanished, panic-stricken, like a shoal
Of darting fish, that on a summer morn,
Adown the crystal dykes at Camelot,
Come slipping o'er their shadows on the sand.
But if a man who stands upon the brink

But lift a shining hand against the sun,
There is not left the twinkle of a fin
Betwixt the cressy islets white in flower.

Or we might instance to the same purpose the following lines from the "Princess":—

Now sleeps the crimson petal, now the white ;
Nor waves the cypress in the palace walk ;
Nor winks the gold fin in the porphyry font.
The fire-fly wakens : waken thou with me.
Now droops the milk-white peacock like a ghost,
And like a ghost she glimmers on to me.

* * * *

Now folds the lily all her sweetness up,
And slips into the bosom of the lake ;
So fold thyself, my dearest, thou, and slip
Into my bosom, and be lost in me.

Again, the simile of the beard, "which youth gone out had left in ashes;" that of Vivien, as the "gilded summer-fly caught in a great old tyrant spider's web;" that of the dark forethought, like "the blind wave feeling about his sea-hall;" that of the warrior's muscle, like "a wild brook sloping o'er a stone;" and others, will bear comparison with the finest efforts of the same kind in the old masters. But we ought, perhaps, to notice that the last-mentioned of these similes is slightly altered from the *Διόσκουροι* of Theocritus:—

*Ἐν δὲ μύες στερεοῦσι βραχίουσιν ἄκρον ὑπ' ὤμων
Ἔστασαν, ἦντε πέτραι ὀλοοῖτροχοι οὔστε κυλίνδων
Χειμάρρους ποταμὸς μεγάλας περιέξεσε δίναις.*

Yet when we consider his writings as a whole, we are compelled to rank the Laureate among poets of a secondary class. It is not that a modern is necessarily at a disadvantage because he is a modern. Tennyson's writings furnish ample proof that the ancients have not anticipated all our fine thoughts, and utterly deprived us of the merit of invention. Something to this effect is often stated with much exaggeration. It is not that the mere fact of antiquity is everything, because a poem, like some beautiful edifice, wants the charm of age to render it venerable, for the disadvantage of newness will cure itself. Time will at length unfailingly bestow that quality which poets have sometimes feebly attempted to acquire by adopting the language of an anterior date. But, if the truth must be said, Tennyson has more gracefulness than vigour; he evinces a fine fancy rather than a lofty imagination; and his proper field is the beautiful rather than the sublime: whereas it is just

vigour, imagination, and sublimity, unless we are much mistaken, that constitute the hitherto unapproached greatness of Homer and Dante, of Milton and Shakespeare. Tennyson, who, we should say, is superior to Byron in almost every other respect, must yield the palm to him in one important item of high poetic excellence. As a general rule, we do not find in any of the Laureate's writings the sustained grandeur, majestic boldness, and fervid enthusiasm of the last canto of *Childe Harold*. The manner in which these writers respectively treat the subject of the ocean (though the treatment of either is admirable of its kind) is especially characteristic of their opposite gifts. Both are supposed to be viewing the sea from a height—Tennyson in a fragment of some five or six remarkable lines; Byron in the well-known address to the ocean, with which the canto in question closes. The Laureate paints the ocean in his usual manner. It is a little word-picture, faithful as a photograph. Though rough surges lash the sounding shore, yet to that dizzy height, where the eagle clasps his mountain-walls, "tinged with the azure world," no sound reaches of the turmoil beneath. At that dizzy height the heave of the wave is not seen, and the great rollers are mere wrinkles on the deep; at that dizzy height the rush of the wave, too, is lost, as well as its mass, and the sea only creeps—creeps to its foam on the shingles.—

The wrinkled sea beneath him crawls,
He watches from his mountain walls,
And like a thunder-bolt he falls.

This is fine; but how different from Byron! He can see beyond his vision's ken, and hear beyond the range of his hearing. He, too, speaks of the sea when it first shines in view from the Alban Mount, and when it must have looked to him like a line of silver braiding the horizon; but not thus does he picture it. It is little enough that he sees, still it is the ocean—there is everything in that one word:—

Roll on, thou dark and deep blue ocean—roll!
Ten thousand fleets sweep over thee in vain.

To Tennyson, in fact, the sight suggests a poetic picture of nature, in painting the beauties of which he far surpasses Byron; while to Byron it suggests a poetic flight of imagination—he is inspired by it, and has glowing language about it; but after all it is but an accessory to his theme, and an occasion for the expression of his sentiment.

But we would not be understood as meaning that Tennyson has no gift at all for the sublime; some of the very passages

we have cited would contradict the assertion, and we might add to them others, did we not fear to overburden our pages with quotations. As it is, we cannot forbear instancing the little scene at the opening of the "*Morte d'Arthur*," which is grand, after the manner of Ossian :—

On one side lay the ocean, and on one
Lay a great water, and the moon was full.

Still no one, we think, who is conversant with these poems, will be disposed to deny what we have just said, that Tennyson's speciality is the beautiful rather than the sublime; and that it is something more than the fact that he has written only a few epical fragments, which excludes him from being ranked among the great epic poets, and which will continue to exclude him, even when, as we fully believe, his merits will be more universally acknowledged than they are now, and the mellowed charm which antiquity imparts will be added to the real beauty of his writings.

In giving publication to these remarks upon the writings of one about whom so much has already been written, we have had in view this twofold object :—first, to draw the attention of such as have been offended by the puerilities and mannerisms of the Laureate's writings to his real merits; and secondly, to protest against a fashion of poetical writing, for which Mr. Tennyson is certainly responsible. And if any one shall consider that such a protest is uncalled for, let him call to mind that the *Reviews*, which are supposed to guide the popular taste, are themselves encouraging the fashion. A short time ago, as many of our readers will remember, appeared a poem called "*Tannhäuser*," written, as stated on the title-page, by Neville Temple and Edward Trevor. The *Times* lauded the poem to the skies, in a review which must have realized a small fortune for the bookseller; but, though decidedly pretty, "*Tannhäuser*" was one of those poems which nobody would care to read twice, and so curiously imitated the Tennysonian manner, that it might almost have passed for one of the Laureate's feeble productions. And it was only a few weeks ago that the *Athenæum* discovered a new and great light in "*Jean Ingelow*," and at the same time stimulated our curiosity by the announcement that her poetry was decidedly *not* Tennysonian. But, alas! once more we were doomed to be disappointed; she *is* Tennysonian, and the views of the writer of the article himself, in spite of his protest against what he facetiously calls pyrotechnical displays, are also Tennysonian—they are all Tennysonian. The few spirited stanzas quoted from her best poem, "*Divided*," were almost the only passages worth quoting in a somewhat

lengthy poem ; and we were generally disappointed in the other pieces. Had we not been led to expect great things, perhaps we had read this little volume with a more favourable eye ; for, though the style is somewhat strained and artificial, and the sentences here and there involved and obscure, yet the writer has plainly a fair share of the poetical gift. It is a pity such an author (and others who, in those little effusions with which they embellish our journals, have adopted the " In Memoriam " stanza) should not understand the disadvantage of challenging comparison with a writer of Tennyson's calibre, although they may be able to say a smart thing in the word-painting style, like that of " an empty sky, a world of heather " which captivated the writer in the *Athenæum*. The result of these mistaken notions has been well described by Mr. Matthew Arnold ; but he seems to fall into the opposite mistake of placing the essence of poetry in the *action* of the poem. " We have poems," he says, " which seem to exist merely for the sake of single lines and passages, not for the sake of producing any total impression : we have critics who direct their attention merely to detached expressions, to the language about the action, not to the action itself. I verily think that the majority of them do not in their hearts believe that there is such a thing as total impression to be derived from a poem at all, or to be demanded from a poet ; they think the term a commonplace of metaphysical criticism. They will permit the poet to select any action he pleases, and to suffer that action to go as it will, provided he gratifies them with occasional bursts of fine writing, and with a shower of isolated thoughts and images." Nor is this merely a critic's account of the matter, but "*habemus confitentem reum* : Keats, the father of the word-painting school, admits, in the preface to his " *Endymion*," that the reader will perceive in that poem " every error, denoting a feverish attempt rather than a deed accomplished. "The two first books," he says, " and indeed the two last [that is to say, *the whole poem*], I feel sensible are not of such completion as to warrant their passing the press, nor should they, if I thought a year's castigation would do them any good ; it will not, *the foundations are too sandy*. It is just that this youngster should die away ; a sad thought for me, if I had not some hope that while it is dwindling I may be plotting and fitting myself for verses fit to live." But, of course, Tennyson himself is not chargeable with this particular fault of which Keats accuses himself, though Tennyson's admirers have fallen into it. If, in the earlier editions of his works, there were poems which had not much point in them, but seemed to exist for the sake of the fine things said in

them, such poems have been withdrawn from the later editions. Indeed, one piece at least has been suppressed, which *had* a point in it, and a very good point, too, and suitable for the present day,—viz., *Oi Féovres*, the *Flowing Philosophers*, who affirm that there is neither good nor ill, nor essence, nor eternal laws, but that—

All things are as they seem to all,
And all things flow like a stream.

He has, also, suppressed several pieces which contained gross exaggerations of the word-painting style; and has considerably modified his manner in this respect since he first began to publish. It would be impossible, in any of his later poems, to match such a passage, for instance, as the one in “Dualisms,” wherein he speaks of two birds that—

sing together,
Arch-ing blue-glossed necks in the purple weather;

or the following from “The Why and the How” :—

The little bird pipeth why? why?
In the summer woods when the sun falls low,
And the great bird sits on the opposite bough,
And stares in his face, and shouts, how? how?

We would therefore only make the Laureate responsible for the faults of his imitators in this general sense, that they are results of the natural temptations of his style, which he has not himself succeeded in avoiding. The common herd of imitators can but fix on the prettinesses and peculiarities of the writer whom they design to copy: but the fact that he can have a host of imitators is itself a proof how redundant are these eccentricities of style. The greatest geniuses are the most free from mannerisms, and the least susceptible of vulgar imitation. Hence they stand by themselves in their solitary grandeur, and become, not the leaders of a literary fashion, but models and archetypes upon which other gifted minds may form themselves, by aiming, in their measure, at the same ideal excellence which those exalted spirits have attained in their sublime creations. Witness those giants of the poetical world, Homer, Shakespeare, Dante, Milton.

In conclusion, we would warn our youthful aspirants to poetic fame, who think that they will climb the sacred mount at the easy rate of saying a few brilliant things in the Tennysonian manner, to shun this mischievous system, or rather negation of system. Let them study some standard

work like Dryden's "*Absalom and Achitophel*," or Pope's "*Rape of the Lock*" (both of them poems which, in their several kinds, we may safely say, have never been surpassed by later writers), in which the effect depends upon the separate words, waiving the exigencies of rhyme and metre, only in the same general way that it does in prose. But what are we saying? Who reads Pope or Dryden now-a-days? Certainly not the class of writers to whom this advice is offered, and who are consequently the worst judges of its suitableness. This is much to be deplored. There is danger in our day of thought being sacrificed to sentiment and imagery. It becomes most needful, therefore, to study the productions of a period where the tendency was altogether different—not with a view of restoring a style which is out of harmony with the modern mind, but of correcting the corrupt tendencies incidental to our own very beauties and merits. Pope would be considered far too didactic for the taste of our day, and assuredly he is as wanting in richness of imagery as in appreciation of nature: but how every line is instinct with thought! Poets, or would-be poets, now-a-days, think it is enough to *feel*, and anon begin to write, though they may have little or nothing to put forth save some vague and dreamy suggestion, the import of which peradventure they themselves do not understand, but which their admirers mistake for profundity. Tennyson, however, will live,—his best writings at least will live. True, he may not always remain a popular poet. People will weary of his peculiarities, as they wearied of the froth-and-fury style which was in vogue in 1830: still we have no doubt that the Laureate of the Victorian Age will always be admired by those whose admiration is alone worth having. But who will care fifty years hence to read the imitators of Tennyson?

ART. V.—RENAN'S "VIE DE JÉSUS."

Vie de Jésus. Par Ernest Renan, Membre de l'Institut. Paris : Levy. 1863.

The Life of Jesus. By Ernest Renan, Member of the Institute of France.
London : Trübner & Co. 1864.

IF Pantheism were ever to become the creed of the human race, and this book the Iliad of a new literature, there would at all events never be any contest between rival countries as to which should claim the author as its child. Italy, Spain, Germany, and England would lose all their chance of such an honour the moment the book was read. It may have been written in the Lebanon, but it must have been by one who took about with him the atmosphere of Paris. He may try to father himself upon Strauss ; but it is like an exquisite dancing-master declaring himself a German boor. The Parisian elegance and polish of this new attack on the Christian faith stamp its origin beyond mistake : we will not say the same of its frivolity and shallowness ; for those are qualities which the infidels of all nations share alike. It is got up, like some incomparable toilet or unapproachable *entremet*, with that perfect art which hides itself under the appearance of nature and ease. The more solid parts, such as they are, of its argument are just paraded enough to make us aware of their existence, and to induce us to believe that there is more in them than meets the eye, while the more attractive and pictorial portions are thrown in with an air of negligence, and toned down so as not to be too obtrusive. As a work of art, then, looked at merely from without—for this qualification is very necessary—it is just such as might have been expected from a Frenchman. Moreover, there is a dash about it which reminds us of the Zouaves. Macaulay makes the Roman plebeian say,—

A Cossus, like a wild cat, flies ever at the face ;

and whatever may be the force or the weakness of M. Renan's assault, at all events he has struck at a vital part at once. There is none of that leisurely and laborious mode of controversy which may be compared to the old systems of military tactics which the French revolutionary wars have the credit of having exploded. The well-trained Austrian generals calculated, to their cost, on their enemy's approaching slowly in their front, and making good his footing and securing his

communications before he proceeded to further movements. Suddenly he was found to have thrown himself on the rear of the defending armies, and to be storming the central fortress. M. Renan has certainly, with all his politeness and *nonchalance*, struck a blow at the heart of the Christian system, while others are engaged in attacking its outworks. There is no question with him about Jehovist and Elohist, the Mosaic record of creation, the Deluge, or the Exodus. He leaves behind him the antiquity of man, and the pre-Adamite question; fossil jaw-bones, kitchen middens, and flint-heads; the origin of species, and our development out of the higher classes of the apes. He goes to the main point at once, and we cannot but be thankful to him for it. *Proinde, omittite Sagunti atque Iberi mentionem facere, et quod diu parturit animus vester, aliquando pariat.* Why all this talk about Moses and the Pentateuch? Why so anxious about fodder for the cattle of the Israelites in the desert, and the time that it may have taken to multiply a small tribe into a great nation in the land of Goshen? Let us meet on the central question at once,—whether the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us. The key to the whole position is in the Gospel history. Take away the facts that have been handed down to us by Matthew and Mark, Luke and John, and then you may bury the Christian religion with all the honours due to a system which has occupied the mind and heart of man for so many centuries. A compliment is a graceful thing; it blesses him that gives and him that takes, and it costs nothing when it follows a death-blow. You may exaggerate, therefore, if you can, the greatness of the "founder of Christianity," and the place that his religion has filled in the history of the world. Crown him with all the epithets that can be attributed to a human being: make him the noblest, the wisest, the most attractive of men: you may be even inconsistent in the extravagance of your generosity, and forget the flaws that you yourself have pointed out. Make his religion the one central and ruling fact in the development and progress of the human race: here, again, you may outrun your own argument, and attribute the greatest and most divine work that has ever been done on earth to causes and principles which, if you estimate them rightly, could hardly have ruffled the stagnation of ages by a momentary sensation. You may say anything of Christianity after you have denied its foundation; you may safely make anything of its author, when you have once determined that the Child of Mary was not the Son of the Living God.

Those versed in the shifty and delusive phraseology in which modern Pantheism delights, will find little difficulty in

discovering that M. Renan is to be numbered among its votaries. Since the publication of the volume before us, he has put forward views still more unmistakable in an article in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*. In the present work, he distinctly avows a disbelief in Christianity, and claims this as one of his qualifications for the office of a fair biographer of its founder. This modern school, however, does not openly profess that deadly hatred of our religion of which Voltaire and his followers were the exponents and propagators. There is no "Ecrasez l'infame" in the pages of M. Renan. Of course, he and others like him must get rid of the whole fabric and system of the Catholic Church. Her doctrines, priesthood, hierarchy, ritual, and sacraments are simply in their way: they will have nothing sublime and supernatural; no asceticism, no spirituality, no celibacy, no miracles; and not a few of the stern and precise precepts of Gospel morality are as distasteful to them as are the tremendous sanctions under which its laws are enforced. But these things, after all, matter but little in the Pantheistic view.

Those who are unwilling to conceive of man as a compound of two substances, and who see in the theistical dogma of the immortality of the soul a contradiction to physiology, love to repose in the hope of a final reparation, which, under some unknown form, shall satisfy the needs of the human heart. Who knows if the last term of progress, after millions of ages, may not bring an absolute consciousness of the universe, and, in this consciousness, the awakening again of all that has lived? *

Such is the chance for futurity, to which the disciples of this school are bid to look. It is a mere "qui sait si;" and with this theory and this prospect the matters of which we have been speaking must seem hardly worth the attention that is implied by dislike. On the other hand, these writers acknowledge, for purposes of their own, the great moral, social, and intellectual benefits bestowed upon the world by Christianity. Of course they pervert and misrepresent its action as well as its principles; but all this is something very different from the

* "Ceux qui ne se plient pas à concevoir l'homme comme un composé de deux substances, et qui trouvent le dogme déiste de l'immortalité de l'âme en contradiction avec la physiologie, aiment à se reposer dans l'espérance d'une réparation finale, qui sous une forme inconnue satisfera aux besoins du cœur de l'homme. Qui sait si le dernier terme du progrès, dans des millions de siècles, n'amènera pas la conscience absolue de l'univers, et dans cette conscience le reveil de tout ce qui a vécu?" (p. 288).

We may remark that in this passage, the words "conscience absolue," are rendered "absolute conscience" in the authorized English translation of M. Renan's work. The Pantheistic view is sufficiently absurd in itself, and need not be made more so by a mistranslation.

tone of the infidels of the last century, who laid to the charge of the dominant religion every misery and evil under which society suffers. M. Renan claims for himself and his friends, in their own sense, the title of disciples of Christ. Let them understand His religion in their own way, and treat it as they please, and they are its votaries. "Grâce à de féconds malentendus," the kingdom of heaven has immensely advanced the human race in its career of eternal progress. "C'était la religion pure, sans pratiques, sans temple, sans prêtre—c'était le jugement moral du monde décerné à la conscience de l'homme juste et au bras du peuple." * Thus, as a writer praised by M. Renan has put it, "le dernier mot de l'innovation n'est autre que le premier de la tradition." † If we tame a lion, and cut his claws and draw his teeth, he looks like the same lion still, and we may allow him to walk about the house in safety. Christianity tamed down, and with its teeth drawn, may be allowed to make its home in the great palace of civilized and enlightened humanity; and the advocates of the new theories have thus the incalculable advantage of connecting themselves with the great names and glories of the past. They are no longer moral revolutionists, teaching a full-grown and well-educated humanity to cast aside all its traditions and disavow the training of its youth. They are "the heirs of all the ages, in the foremost files of time;" and the world would hardly give them a hearing, if they did not so represent themselves. They must be the children of the past, if they would be accepted as the fathers of the future. They must have, then, a history of progress, to show the legitimacy of their descent, and to prove the authority of their claims; and as the influence of the Christian religion is too great and striking an element to be ignored in any history of civilization, they must, in some way or other, place themselves in harmony with that influence, at least apparently. ‡

* "It was pure religion, without observances, without temple, without priest: it was the moral judgment of the world, awarded to the conscience of the just man and to the arm of the people."

† "The last word of innovation was no other than the first of tradition."—D'Eichthal, *Les Évangiles*, tom. i. Pref. lxii.

‡ The author just quoted (D'Eichthal) finds fault with Saint-Simon for writing a *Nouveau Christianisme*. "Quel que fût, en effet, son admiration pour le principe chrétien, Saint-Simon croyait que ce principe, pour l'adapter à la civilisation moderne, devait subir ce qu'il appelait une *régénération*, une *transfiguration*. Il n'avait pas compris la portée du précepte, Rendez à César ce qui est à César, et à Dieu ce qui est à Dieu; il n'avait pas vu que la civilisation moderne, avec tous ses développements passés et futurs, dérivait de là, et que, par conséquent, un nouveau christianisme était superflu."

"Whatever may have been, in fact, his admiration for the Christian prin-

These considerations may serve to explain the appearance of the volume before us, and the pains that have been taken by the antichristian press abroad to trumpet it forth as a great success. A school such as we have been describing must have some positive account, however false, to give of our Divine Lord. It may be a matter of astonishment that men who believe what they profess to believe, can think it worth their while to write books and build up theories about anything; but if they are to take up a scientific position, and to interpret existing phenomena consistently with their own tenets, they cannot be content with a merely destructive and negative treatment of the received history of Christ. Their starting-point is Christian civilization: they must have their own account of its author and founder. They do not ignore those few years in the reigns of Augustus and Tiberius on which the whole history of the world has turned: the success of the disciples of the faith then established is not with them, as with some infidels, a fortunate chance, but it is to be attributed to the principles, the character, the career of their Master. We shall not pain our readers by quoting any of the high-flown eulogies in which writers of this school pretend to do homage to our Lord. It is enough for our present purpose to say that He is far too important a figure in the world's history, as they read it, to be consigned to the obscurity in which negative criticism would leave Him. Where Strauss and others have destroyed, M. Renan, therefore, builds again. His task, at first sight, is not an easy one: he cannot accept the "legendary" view, by which the birth of the Gospel history, as we possess it, is fixed in the second century of the Christian era. If he is to construct, he must have materials; and he can get them nowhere but from the four Evangelists. He greatly exaggerates, as we shall see, the importance of one or two other collateral sources of information; but, after all, he can go nowhere but to the Gospels for all that is of importance. Yet, if he uses them, must he not take them as he finds them? How can he accept the Evangelists as authoritative witnesses, and yet select what he chooses and reject what displeases him in their testimony? How is he either to overawe or to beguile his readers into giving him unbounded confidence, while he

ciple, Saint-Simon believed that this principle, in order to adapt itself to modern civilisation, must undergo what he called a *regeneration*, a *transfiguration*. He did not understand the import of the precept, 'Render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's'; he did not perceive that modern civilization, with all its developments, past and future, had its derivation thence, and that consequently a new Christianity was superfluous."—Pref. p. lxiii.

manipulates and modifies the Gospel narrative just as suits his purpose, rejecting large portions, altering the order of time, and drawing an entirely new portrait of the character around which all the interest centres? He has made the attempt, and has produced a work of great ingenuity; but he has destroyed whatever reputation he ever possessed as a scientific critic. He has simply added, in the nineteenth century, a fresh specimen to the list of those literary curiosities known by the name of the Apocrypha of the New Testament.

It is somewhat remarkable that M. Renan, who includes among his sources of information the Talmud and the Apocrypha of the Old Testament, should have distinctly put aside, as unworthy of notice, the "Apocryphal Gospels." We are certainly not inclined to exaggerate their importance; though it is not impossible that they may contain one or two shreds of old and authentic tradition. But the writers of the very worst of the classes into which those compositions may be divided—that which contains the forgeries manufactured by heretics for the purpose of palming off a view of the life and teaching of our Lord in harmony with their own doctrines—are the only literary ancestors of M. Renan. Allowing for differences of persons and countries, time, place, and literary style, M. Renan has done nothing which they have not done before him, saving only that he has prefixed to his Gospel an Introduction of about sixty pages, which is meant to be the critical foundation on which the remainder of the work is based. It was not the fashion to do this in the second century; but we have no doubt that many heretics could have written with as fair an appearance of learning, for their time, as M. Renan for his. This is the only part of the work before us that it is worth our while, as critics, to examine in detail, and we shall proceed presently to estimate its value. Let us, however, first suppose that this "*Vie de Jésus*" had been lost, and that our only acquaintance with it consisted in a short summary of it preserved by some bibliographer, answering in this respect to Papias, Eusebius, or S. Jerome. The account he would give of the "Gospel of Renan" would be something as follows:—

Jesus was born at Nazareth, of a poor family, which did not belong, as was afterwards pretended, to the stock of David. He was one, perhaps the eldest, of several brothers and sisters. He passed his youth in the place of his birth, and learned to read and write from the clerk of the synagogue; but it is doubtful whether he understood Hebrew, and he probably knew no Greek. He had no acquaintance with Greek civilization, nor did he know anything of the Essenes or Therapeutæ, or of the writings of Philo. He seems, however, to have met with some of the aphorisms of Hillel. He was much

struck by the Old Testament Scriptures, particularly the Psalms ; as also by some of the Apocryphal writings of a later date, especially one falsely attributed to Daniel, but in reality the work of a Jew of the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. He practised the trade of his father, who was a carpenter. We cannot trace the beginnings of his assuming the office of teacher. He had no theology, no system : he looked upon God as his Father, and considered himself in immediate relation with Him. He did not preach his opinions, he preached himself, and attracted his disciples to love him by the charm of his person. He taught them to look on God as their Father—this was the meaning of the "kingdom of heaven," of which he chiefly spoke. He taught, also, a beautiful and matchless morality, which, however, he had learned from others who had gone before him : but he was original in the efficacy of his preaching. He did not teach austerity nor condemn enjoyment : his progress in Galilee was a perpetual feast ; he used to go to marriage banquets and other entertainments—women and children were his principal followers.

When Jesus had already formed a school of his own, he went to the Jordan, and fell under the influence of John the Baptist. The sterner and more violent character of John affected his course for the future. Instead of confining himself to his "delicious morality," he began to think of producing a great and universal change in the world : he became a revolutionary reformer. He began to abuse the world, and founded the great doctrine of "transcendental disdain !" Thus he was the author of the true liberty of the soul—though he did not understand the soul to be distinct from the body, and was in no sense a spiritualist. He talked about an approaching destruction of the world, and a future state of restoration and renovation. This doctrine of his was fortunately understood afterwards in a different sense from his own. In order to gain the multitude, he condescended to their prejudices. Thus he adopted the rite of baptism which had been so successful with John. He took the name of the Son of Man, and allowed himself to be called the Son of David with pleasure, though with some embarrassment. He fixed his head-quarters at Capharnaum. He allowed his disciples to think that he understood their thoughts, that he had revelations, and conversed with Moses and Elias on the mountains. The rich did not follow him, and he began to condemn riches, and speak of the approaching triumph of the poor. Gradually enthusiasm began to spread and deepen in himself and others. He came to accept the rôle of the promised Messiah ; and he quoted as an authoritative witness the testimony of John in his favour. When he went to Jerusalem for the feasts, he was not well received, and his peasant simplicity was scandalized at what he saw in the Temple. He came to the conclusion that the Law must be abolished. Meanwhile, the admiration of his followers forced him on further and further. He was obliged to submit to be considered a thaumaturge. This character was forced upon him against his will ; but he gave in to it : and we must remember that "history is impossible, if we do not admit a great many different standards of sincerity !" He became thus a worker of miracles. Many times these were illusions : the contact of an "exquisite person" is worth all the resources of the medical art, and Jesus could not refuse to do the good which the faith of the multitude required of him. Sometimes he did things which look like

jugglery. There was a general belief then in demoniacal possession : persons who were only silly, were supposed to be possessed ; and a word or look from a person like Jesus made them calm and happy. The Orientals are very frugal ; and when he was in the desert with a multitude of followers, they ate so little, that it was thought miraculous. His doctrine became more and more severe, his words stronger and more violent. He used expressions about his body and blood, to which afterwards a literal meaning was applied in a way quite extravagant. He denounced property, and marriage, and taught that his followers must declare war against flesh and blood, and all natural ties. By these exaggerated requirements, he obtained afterwards the great results that his religion has produced.

He now conceived the idea of sacrificing himself for the cause he had taken up. Each time he went up to Jerusalem, he put himself more and more in opposition to the ruling sacerdotal authorities of the nation : he broke out into furious invectives against them. He became a fanatic. The pretended character of the Son of David, the Messiah, was more and more closely fixed upon him as his admirers gained more faith and enthusiasm from his pretended miracles ; and his ill-success at Jerusalem, where he disputed with learned men without being victorious, embittered him more and more against the existing state of things, whose defenders again became more hostile to him as he became more bitter. A singular incident at Bethany, where, perhaps, the members of a family devoted to him contrived an apparent miracle of the most wonderful kind, sealed his fate. Something that passed for a resurrection seems to have taken place. The "party of order" came to the politic conclusion that it was better that one man should die than that the whole nation should perish.

M. Renan relates the history of the last week and Passion of Jesus in a way more like the received Gospels than the rest of the life. He says that Judas was enraged at the loss of the money for which the ointment of Magdalene might have been sold : but that his treason was the result of a momentary impulse, rather than of deliberate perversity. Jesus did not establish the Eucharist at the Last Supper, but some time previous. Before his arrest in the Garden, he seems to have had a struggle with himself, and perhaps he regretted the part that he had undertaken. Being brought before the Sanhedrim, he was condemned for some words which he had allowed to escape him—that he would destroy the Temple of God, and rebuild it in three days. He would not explain them when alleged against him. It is probable, says Renan, that the account of the adjuration by the High Priest, and the confession of Jesus that he was the Messiah, is incorrect. But the account of John, as to what passed with Pilate, is authentic. It may be doubted whether what is said about the crowning with thorns and the mocking by the soldiers is true. Pilate could not give any other sentence than he did : the "secular power" was forced to act by the fanatical fury of the religious party among the Jews. It is wonderful that Jesus died so soon on the Cross ; but our best guarantee for the fact is the inextinguishable hatred of his enemies. He was buried, as the Evangelists relate ; on the morning of the third day the sepulchre was found open. Renan leaves the matter of the Resurrection for the second part of his work ; but he closes his account of the burial of Jesus

with the words—"Disons cependant que la forte imagination de Marie de Magdala joua dans cette circonstance un rôle capitale. Pouvoir divin de l'amour ! moments sacrés, où la passion d'une hallucinée donne au monde un Dieu ressuscité !" *

If Dr. Tischendorf were to present us with a fragment of some ancient author, giving us as the contents of some long-lost heretical Gospel, something like what we have just laid before our readers, it is clear that it would be regarded with curious interest by the learned, as affording us an insight into the tenets of the particular sect which gave it birth ; but that no one, either learned or unlearned, would think of considering it of any value as to the real facts of the life of our Saviour. Yet, as we have hinted, even an heretical and apocryphal Gospel of the second century might contain, by possibility, some trivial details which the author had received from a genuine tradition, and which might not elsewhere have been preserved. Nothing of the sort can be suspected in the case of the Gospel of M. Renan. Why, then, has it any value or weight at all ? Why has it been heralded beforehand, and hailed on its appearance, with the jubilations of the infidel press of the Continent ? Why have so many learned and eminent men among Catholics thought it worth their while either to answer it or to denounce it ?

Whatever may have been the causes of the sensation created by the work before us, and whether its fame is to be permanent or transient, it is clear at least that its only real value, in a scientific point of view, must depend on the security of the critical assumptions on which it is based. We use the word "assumptions," because M. Renan does not put his readers in possession of the processes of reasoning by which he has reached the conclusions which he announces in a very authoritative manner. It is but fair to him to say that he refers generally to a small collection of printed works, and to a series of articles in Reviews, as having more or less furnished him with the grounds of his opinions. A glance, however, at the names of the books alluded to will surprise any one well acquainted with the chief critical works of our time. The productions of the great German schools are not mentioned. In his Introduction, M. Renan compliments Strauss, and indeed attempts, to a certain extent, to connect himself with him ; but there is a radical difference between them, and M.

* "Let us, however, say this much : the bold imagination of Mary of Magdala played in this circumstance a notable part. Divine power of love ! sacred moments, in which the passion of a deluded enthusiast gives to the world a risen God !"

Renan only uses the destructive criticism of his predecessor when it serves his own purposes. The writers with whom he chooses to connect himself belong to what is beginning to be known as the Strasburg school, and have not hitherto been considered as luminaries of any magnitude, even among those with whom they in general agree. Perhaps it was essential to M. Renan to have French authors to recommend to his readers. Their names, however, are hardly of sufficient calibre to add much weight to the statements of M. Renan. The German critics, moreover, have repaid his want of deference to them on a ground which they have so peculiarly made their own, by some rather contemptuous notices of his labours.* If we turn to ancient authorities, and put aside for the moment the four canonical Gospels, M. Renan is certainly very capricious in his selections. He has good reasons, of course, for not making much account of the Epistles of S. Paul, which would obviously harmonize but poorly with his view of the life, character, and institutions of Christ. He discards the Apocryphal Gospels, and we hear nothing of the Apostolical Fathers. But he selects a few of the "Apocrypha" of the Old Testament, such as the Book of Enoch—"which was much read in the circle which surrounded Jesus,"†—the Ascension of Isaias, the Fourth Book of Esdras, and the Jewish portion of the Sibylline verses; with these, acting on the rationalistic principle about prophecy, he classes the Book of Daniel. Any one can see that his list of authentic sources is arbitrary, both as to what it admits and as to what it excludes. He greatly exaggerates the value of Philo—whom he ventures to call "*le frère aîné de Jésus*"‡—as an illustration of the circle of religious ideas in which a simple Galilean artisan of his time would have moved. There would have been about as much in common between them as between a Catholic peasant in the Tyrol and one of M. Renan's "advanced" Professors at Strasburg or Montauban. On the other hand, he under-estimates Josephus. He parades the Talmud among his resources; but if we may believe his critics, he does not know how to quote it correctly, and he has altogether neglected the parts of it which most faithfully reflect the feeling and opinions of the Jews of the time of our Lord as to the promises of the Messiah and the qualities of his character.§

* We may refer our readers to a pamphlet by l'Abbé Meignan, *M. Renan réfuté par les Rationalistes Allemands*.

† "Lequel était fort lu dans l'entourage de Jésus" (p. xi).

‡ "The elder brother of Jesus."

§ Some useful remarks on this point will be found in the work of the Abbé Passaglia,—*Etude sur la Vie de Jésus de M. Ernest Renan* (French

M. Renan has not been the first to have recourse to these secondary sources of information; nor has his use of them been such as to escape severe and just criticism. We do not consider ourselves bound to trouble our readers with the question thus raised, especially as, after all, the features in his work that are drawn from these sources are not very numerous or important. But it is a part of his plan to present himself to his readers with an imposing display of dimly-seen authorities in the background. Napoleon once made an Austrian force, considerably larger than his own, surrender at discretion, by receiving a flag of truce at the head of an immense staff, made up for the nonce of every available officer he could find. The Austrians thought they had fallen in the way of the whole French army, and laid down their arms. M. Renan's staff consists of a host of references to the Talmud and Philo at the bottom of his pages. There is, however, one still more important weapon, which he manipulates most skilfully. He has spent some time in the Holy Land, and is able to give some pleasant and graphic descriptions of the scenery of Galilee and the shores of the Lake of Tiberias. These have been praised, we venture to think, too much. Perhaps they are not quite so much a novelty to ourselves as to our neighbours on the other side of the Channel. M. Renan has more the air of a professional artist than Dr. Stanley; but we think the sketches of the latter have more freshness, as well as more power, than the finished pictures of the French writer. Neither author is loth to take full advantage of his character as a traveller; but then Dr. Stanley has not yet aspired to write a Life of Christ. Both have the trick of throwing an Oriental character over the subjects with which they deal. A good half of the effect of M. Renan's book would be destroyed if he were made to use the common established names for persons and things. We have heard before of the Children of Israel, with their Law and their Prophets; but we bow down with awe before the Beni-Israel, the Thora, and the Nabis. Annas and Caiaphas, Judas Iscariot, Bartholomew, Joseph of Arimathæa—we have known them from our childhood: but they have quite a new look as Hanan and Kaiapha, Judas of Kerioth, Nathanael Bar-Tolmai, and Joseph of Haramathaim. And then, too, the Herodians turn out to be a set of people called the Boethusim, and

translation, chap. viii.). May the prayers of those whom his teaching and writings have benefited in times past, soon win for that learned theologian the grace of a perfect return to Catholic unity! M. Renan's quotations from the Talmud are also remarked upon by the Abbé Freppel, *Examen critique de la Vie de Jésus de M. Renan*, p. 80 (7th edition).

M. Renan will tell us all about the Nifki Pharisees and the Kizai Pharisees, and those who were called Medoukia, and Schikim, and some other varieties besides. We feel half inclined to give up the idea of understanding anything about the great truths of our Redemption till we have read the "fifth Gospel," by the help of a visit to Galilee, and enlisted ourselves among the disciples of M. Neubauer, "*un savant Israélite, très-versé dans la littérature Talmudique*."*

We are very far from denying the importance and value of the advantages possessed by M. Renan in his Oriental and Talmudic learning, and, in a different way, in his acquaintance with the scenery of the Gospel history. But it is one thing to say that a writer as competent as possible in other respects to be the biographer of our Lord, would be able to make his work far more perfect by the addition of these advantages, and quite another thing to admit that they qualify any one who possesses them to demand from us unlimited confidence. Our readers have had the substance of M. Renan's positive assertions concerning our Lord's life placed before them a few pages back; and they will be able to see at a glance what the points are, as to which he would have us substitute his own picture for that drawn by the Evangelists. Any one will be able to perceive that his book is in reality—as far as regards all that is of importance—no novelty at all. There is no need of the Talmud, and Philo-Judæus, and the Book of Enoch, and the Boethusim, and the Oriental costume and scene-painting of which we have spoken, to produce the result before us. A simple and very arbitrary application of the negative criticism which has been in vogue for many years, and a quiet assumption of rationalistic principles as to the supernatural, miracles, and prophecy, are all that are required; and these alone will serve his purpose. All other accessories may embellish his work, and make it read pleasantly to a certain class of people; but they have as little to do with the soundness of his conclusions as the embroidery on the flags of a crack regiment has to do with the result of the battle in which it may be engaged. It may seem a pity to take so pretty a piece of millinery into action; but it certainly will not make the enemy run away—much less will it make their fortifications tumble about their ears. If M. Renan has made any breaches in the received Gospel history, and established any new conclusions about the "noble initiateur," of whom he writes, it will be by the use that he has made of the common weapons of criticism. And thus we come back again to the only question of any

* "A learned Israelite, deeply versed in Talmudic lore."

importance with regard to his work:—How does he justify his treatment of the four canonical Gospels?

At first sight M. Renan seems, for a rationalist, unusually indulgent in his concessions as to the four Gospels. An incautious reader might almost think that he was going to accept them in their integrity. Those who know how authors of this class write, will be well aware that more than half their power of mischief is paralyzed, as soon as the slippery and treacherous character of their language is exposed. Of course, says M. Renan, the Gospels are legendary biographies: "*mais il y a légende et légende*"—and not all are to be rejected at once as worthless. We must not press too strictly the letter of the Gospel according to Matthew, and Mark, and the rest; but if they are in any sense true, and if the books really come to us from the authors whose names they bear, they must have high historical value, as they carry us back to the first half-century after the death of Jesus Christ; and, in two cases, are the works of eye-witnesses of His actions.

Then, he will admit that S. Luke wrote the Gospel that bears his name. He is the author of the Acts, and therefore a companion of S. Paul. It is true that the Gospel was written after the destruction of Jerusalem. Why? M. Renan does not condescend to explain, because it is a received principle with his school that the "prophecy" of an event is always written after it. If we could imagine a rationalist engaged upon critical literature after the Day of Judgment, we might be certain that he would take it for granted that certain uncomfortable passages in the Bible had been composed since that time. The two Gospels of Matthew and Mark, according to M. Renan, though they have not the same stamp of individuality with that of S. Luke, and are not, like it, regular and complete compositions, yet must, in some form or other, have existed before it. Even the Gospel of S. John finds some favour in M. Renan's eyes, though we shall find him singularly self-contradictory in his manner of treating it. The writer, he tells us, uniformly speaks as an eye-witness, and the kind of fraud that is implied by the illegitimate assumption of this character is without example in the apostolical age. He says something very different about the authors of the books of Daniel and Enoch—but that must be a slip. Moreover, there are in this Gospel a number of minute and accurate historical statements that may well be supposed to be an old man's affectionate reminiscences of scenes witnessed long ago. The Gospel was clearly produced towards the end of the first century, and seems to have been known as the work of S. John, in its present form, in the middle of the second.

Thus we have, from M. Renan, a general acceptance of the four Gospels as historical authorities. How, then, does he draw from them such a caricature of the life of our Lord as that which we have sketched for our readers? As far as any reason at all can be found in his pages, it is contained in the modifications on which he insists when he speaks of the Evangelists singly.

With regard to S. Matthew, M. Renan proceeds to discard from his original Gospel almost all its *historical* statements. Not that he means to accept, as having been really said by our Lord, all that this Gospel declares to have been said by Him. He draws a distinction between *discourses* and *actions*: the latter he dismisses, the former he admits when they seem to him authentic.

Là sont les Logia, les notes mêmes prises sur le souvenir vif et net de l'enseignement de Jésus. Une espèce d'éclat à la fois doux et terrible, une force divine, si j'ose le dire, souligne les paroles, les détache du contexte, et les rend pour la critique facilement reconnaissables. La personne qui s'est donné la tâche de faire avec l'histoire évangélique une composition régulière, possède à cet égard une excellente pierre de touche. Les vraies paroles de Jésus se décollent, pour ainsi dire, d'elles-mêmes; dès qu'on les touche dans ce chaos de traditions d'authenticité inégale, on les sent vibrer; elles se traduisent comme spontanément, et viennent d'elles-mêmes se placer dans le récit, où elles gardent un relief sans pareil.*—Introd. pp. xxxvii. xxxviii.

We shall see presently what M. Renan says of the largest portion of the "words of the Lord," that have been preserved to us in the New Testament: at present our business is with his theory as to S. Matthew. The whole hypothesis is built upon a single word of Papias, preserved to us by Eusebius, which M. Renan chooses to understand in a restricted sense.

* The translator has so inadequately rendered the language of M. Renan, that we have thought it best to give the original in the text. The English runs thus:—"They are the Logia, the identical notes taken from a clear and lively remembrance of the teachings of Jesus. A kind of splendour at once mild and terrible—a divine strength, if we may so speak, emphasizes these words, detaches them from the context, and renders them easily distinguishable. The person who imposes upon himself the task of making a continuous narrative from the Gospel history, possesses, in this respect, an excellent touchstone. The real words of Jesus disclose themselves: as soon as we touch them in this chaos of traditions of varied authenticity, we feel them vibrate: they betray themselves spontaneously, and shine out of the narrative with unequalled brilliancy." M. Renan's book would never have made a sensation, if it had been served up to the French public in no better style than this. His translator is like an English cook dealing with the refined and exquisite "ideas" of a great culinary *artiste*. At the same time it must be admitted that to render M. Renan's frothy phrases into plain, intelligible English, requires no little ingenuity and skill.

It is quite amusing to see an author who is not usually very highly esteemed by rationalistic writers, made so much of for the nonce, because he happens to serve a particular purpose. If M. Renan found Papias in his way, he would remind us that Eusebius tells us that he was a man of small intelligence. *σικκρὸς τὸν νοῦν*. However, Papias, according to Eusebius,* mentions that he had heard an explanation from a certain "elder," of the difference between the Gospels of S. Matthew and S. Mark. S. Mark is said to have written accurately what he remembered from S. Peter; not that he put in order the sayings or doings of Christ (*λεχθέντα ἢ πραχθέντα*). He was the companion of Peter, who shaped his teaching according to the need of the moment, not as if he were making a collected history (*σύνταξιν*) of the "oracles of the Lord" (*κυριακῶν λογίων*). Thus, what is first asserted of S. Mark, is in the second place asserted of S. Peter. Neither pretended to give a collected and arranged account. In the clause about S. Mark the subject is called *πραχθέντα ἢ λεχθέντα*: in that about S. Peter it is *λόγια*. So at least it is given by the best editor, the late Dr. Routh, in his "Reliquiæ Sacræ;" but Valerius and Burton—the latter, certainly, for very inconclusive reasons—read *λόγων*. The evidence of manuscripts is in favour of Dr. Routh's reading. The "elder," quoted by Papias, goes on to say that S. Matthew did what the others did not,—*τὰ λόγια συνετάξατο*, he collected and arranged the "oracles." M. Renan would have us believe that the word *λόγια* is meant to describe the discourses of our Lord, and to exclude His actions. We have already seen that it appears to be equivalent to *both*; but as this rests upon a disputed reading, we will simply prove the point by a twofold argument, not derived from the passage itself. In the first place, the word comes from the New Testament, where S. Paul seems to use it (Rom. iii. 2) of the whole of the Old Testament Scriptures. In the second place, Papias himself, whose meaning is here in question, described his own collection of Apostolical "memoirs" as *λόγια*; and in this collection it is quite certain

* The passage occurs in Euseb. Hist. Eccl., l. iii. c. ult. We give it, for the convenience of our readers, as it stands in Dr. Routh's "Reliquiæ Sacræ," t. i. p. 12:—*καὶ τοῦθ' ὁ πρεσβύτερος λέγει· Μάρκος μὲν ἑρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου γενόμενος, ὅσα ἐμνημόνευσεν, ἀκριβῶς ἐγράψεν· οὐ μὲντοι τάξει τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἢ λεχθέντα ἢ πραχθέντα· οὔτε γὰρ ἤκουσε τοῦ Κυρίου, οὔτε παρηκολούθησεν αὐτῷ· ὕστερον δὲ, ὡς ἔφη Πέτρω, δεῦρος τὰς χρείας ἐποιεῖτο τὰς διδασκαλίας· ἀλλ' οὐχ ὥσπερ σύνταξιν τῶν Κυριακῶν ποιούμενος λογίων· ὥς τε οὐδὲν ἡμαρτε Μάρκος, οὕτως ἐνία γράψας ὡς ἀμνημονόησεν· ἐνδὲς γὰρ ἐποίησατο πρόνοιαν, τοῦ μηδὲν ὧν ἤκουσε παραλείπειν, ἢ ψεύσασθαι τι ἐν αὐτοῖς . . . Ματθαῖος μὲν οὖν Ἐβραϊδὶ διαλέκτῳ τὰ λόγια συνετάξατο· ἡρμήνευσε δ' αὐτὰ ὡς ἡ ὀνόματις ἕκαστος.*

that actions, as well as sayings, were included. But even granting the restricted sense of the word to be the more correct, it would be very unfair to argue from it here. The "elder" is not giving a general account of the Gospels, but explaining what seemed to him a defect in S. Mark's Gospel as compared with that of S. Matthew. The latter contained many things omitted by the former, and appeared to be superior in arrangement. This is the most probable interpretation: but even if the "elder" was speaking of "discourses" only—for the Gospel of S. Mark contains very few of them—his assertion only goes so far as to account for their absence in S. Mark, and to affirm their presence in S. Matthew, and cannot by any means be tortured into the meaning that S. Matthew gave *nothing but* discourses.

This is the single and slender foundation on which M. Renan's hypothesis with regard to the original Gospel of S. Matthew is based. We need hardly add, that the hypothesis itself shows a great want of critical discrimination. The Gospel of S. Matthew is a perfect whole, in which unity of design and mutual dependence of parts can easily be pointed out; perhaps more easily than in the case of any other of the Gospels. The history cannot be detached from the discourses, nor the discourses from the history.

At first sight, M. Renan seems more inclined to deal fairly with the Gospel of S. Mark. It is at all events founded, he says, on the anecdotes and memoirs written down by S. Mark from the recollections of an eye-witness; and there is nothing to contradict the statement of Papias, that this eye-witness was S. Peter. And yet, after all, S. Mark is the one of the Evangelists of whom M. Renan makes, perhaps, the least account, for reasons which we shall before long have to mention. We must first, however, let our readers into the secret of an ingenious method by which any one may eliminate anything that displeases him from the text of his authorities. M. Renan has a theory about the formation of the present Gospels which leaves him, or any other critic, entirely at liberty to take or reject the materials before them at discretion. Contrary to every single witness of the highest antiquity, he declares that, for the first century and a half, the text of the Gospels was of no authority, and no care was taken to preserve it.

There was no scruple in inserting additions, in variously combining them, and in completing some by others. The poor man who has but one book wishes that it may contain all that is dear to his heart. These little books were lent, each one transcribed in the margin of his copy the words, and the parables he found elsewhere, which touched him. The most beautiful thing

in the world has thus proceeded from an obscure and purely popular elaboration!—*Eng. Trans.* p. 12.*

Since the doctrine of the origin of the world from the fortuitous concurrence of atoms was exploded, no hypothesis more absurd than this has been gravely put forward. Perhaps, we should hardly say *gravely*—M. Renan must be too clever to believe it himself. He must be playing with his readers, and practising one of those lower degrees of sincerity the existence of which he is so anxious to establish as necessary for the comprehension of history. People, then, collected the sayings and actions of our Lord much in the way in which young ladies nowadays collect *carte-de-visite* portraits. Somehow or other, "par une élaboration obscure et complètement populaire," four distinct Gospels emerge from this process: the text is the same, the arrangement the same, the distinctive character and contents of each one of the four are the same everywhere. That is, each one of these obscure "élaborateurs" made up four separate books, and put the same contents into each in the same order. And, of course, as they felt no scruple in adding to the text in order to make it, according to their ideas, more perfect, we need feel none in mutilating it in order to make it, according to our ideas, more original. What a pity that this theory was not invented before! What pains heretics have taken, and still take—witness Dr. Wordsworth's edition of the New Testament—to get rid of those awkward words: "*Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church!*" How many hundred interpretations of the simple declaration, "*This is My Body,*" have been painfully excogitated in the last three centuries! If they had but had M. Renan with his *petits livrets* theory, to what much better purposes might all this ingenuity have been applied! How provoking must it be to Mr. Maurice to have wasted so much time over the word "everlasting," and to the writers of the "Essays and Reviews," to have had to establish their liberty at the cost of so much litigation! "They manage these things better in France." And yet M. Renan is perfectly well aware that nothing is more demonstrably certain, as a fact of history in the first centuries of the Church, than the zealous care with which the text of the Scriptures and,

* "On ne se faisait nul scrupule d'y insérer des additions, de les combiner diversement, de les compléter les uns par les autres. Le pauvre homme qui n'a qu'un livre veut qu'il contienne tout ce qui lui va au cœur. On se prêtait ces petits livrets: chacun transcrivait à la marge de son exemplaire les mots, les paraboles qu'il trouvait ailleurs et qui le touchaient. La plus belle chose du monde est ainsi sortie d'une élaboration obscure et complètement populaire."

above all, of the four Gospels, was guarded. Let heretics take a word from or add a verse to the Gospels—the fraud was sure to be denounced in a moment. He will say, perhaps, that this vigilance was of a later date than the time of which he is speaking. We reply that if it existed in the second century, it must have been an inheritance from the first; and it is quite incompatible with the theory of the "*petits livrets*." The Church never made any distinction between the Old and New Testament Scriptures, as to her jealous custody of the sacred text committed to her charge. S. Peter himself speaks of S. Paul's Epistles along with "the other Scriptures."

This principle, of course, will enable M. Renan to do anything he likes with S. Mark. He will use him now and then for the minute and graphic touches of incident and character with which the Gospel abounds; but another great principle must forbid him doing more. Experience, says M. Renan, has demonstrated the impossibility of anything supernatural. As for miracles, he does not say that they are impossible: he is content with asserting that none have ever yet taken place under the requisite scientific conditions.* Miracles, therefore, must be made away with as well as prophecy. S. Mark, unfortunately, is full of these things. He is the Evangelist of miraculous cures and of instances of the casting out of devils. M. Renan, of course, does not believe either in the reality of the cures or in the existence of the devils; and it may, therefore, be easily imagined how much he will admit of S. Mark's Gospel, short as it is, and mainly devoted to the actions rather than to the teaching of our Lord.

* "We do not say," says M. Renan, "miracles are impossible. We say, up to this time a miracle has never been proved. If to-morrow a thaumaturge present himself with credentials sufficiently important to be discussed, and announce himself as able, say, to raise the dead, what would be done? A commission, composed of physiologists, physicists, chemists, persons accustomed to historical criticism, would be named. The commission would choose a corpse, would assure itself that the death was real, would select the room in which the experiment should be made, would arrange the whole system of precautions, so as to leave no chance of doubt. If under such conditions the resurrection were effected, a probability almost equal to certainty would be established," &c. (p. 30). For our part, to put aside the impiety of this proposal, for it assumes as certain that miracles are not worked by the power of God, but by some one whom we may tie down to our own conditions—we prefer the Scribes and Pharisees, the executioners, Longinus with his spear, the sealing of the stone, and the Roman guard, to any commission "of physiologists, physicists, chemists, and persons accustomed to historical criticism." M. Renan has forgotten the very obvious difficulty, that these people might all be in the plot, especially, of course, if they were Orientals. Under such conditions, modern Pantheists might produce what Calvin is said to have attempted—a sham miracle.

The early chapters of S. Luke's Gospel do not receive more favour from M. Renan. Of course the whole "legend" of our Lord's conception, birth, and infancy must be discarded. M. Renan, however, uses S. Luke for his own purposes. We have already mentioned some of the eulogies that he passes on the third Gospel, as a regular composition, entirely from one hand: we are presently told that the value of this Gospel is far inferior to that of S. Mark's—that it is a second-hand production; that its sayings of our Lord are more considered and composite. But M. Renan has a number of compliments to shower on S. Luke. His Gospel is full of mistakes, which he might have avoided if he had had the advantage of M. Renan's advice in its composition.

He has a false idea of the Temple, which he represents as an oratory, where people go to practise their devotions; he rounds off the details in his attempt to reconcile the different accounts; he softens down the passages which had become embarrassing when viewed in relation with a more exalted idea of the Divinity of Jesus; he exaggerates the marvellous; he is guilty of errors in chronology; he is quite ignorant of Hebrew, cites no word of Jesus in that tongue; designates all the localities by their Greek names. He is a very strict devotee; he stickles for the fact of Jesus having fulfilled all the Jewish rites; he is an enthusiastic democrat and Ebionite; that is to say, he is strongly opposed to the rights of property, and persuaded that the poor are about to have their revenge, &c.*

This passage is so characteristic of M. Renan, and gives so fair a specimen of his way of quoting, that it is worth while to make a few remarks upon it, and examine the proofs he gives of these assertions. S. Luke has a false idea of the temple, as if it were a place of private devotion. Why? Because (ii. 37) he mentions the devotion of Anna in the temple—in the midst of an account of its legal and sacrificial use; because he gives the parable of the Pharisee and the Publican; and because he says that the apostles were "always in the temple, praising and blessing God" (xxiv. 53). He might have quoted the Acts (iii. 1), but he seems to have forgotten the

* "Il a une fausse idée du temple, qu'il se représente comme un oratoire, où l'on va faire ses dévotions; il emousse les détails pour tâcher d'amener une concordance entre les différents récits: il adoucit les passages qui étaient devenus embarrassant au point de vue d'une idée plus exaltée de la divinité de Jésus; il exagère le merveilleux, il commet des erreurs de chronologie, il ignore totalement l'hébreu, ne cite aucune parole de Jésus en cette langue, nomme toutes les localités par leur nom grec. . . ." M. Renan will tell us his individual character. "C'est un dévot très-exact—il tient à ce que Jésus ait accompli tous les rites juifs—il est démocrate et Ébionite exalté, c'est-à-dire très-opposé à la propriété et persuadé que la revanche des pauvres va venir," etc. (xii.).

passage. We take the liberty of saying, that all authorities agree in representing S. Luke's idea of the temple as a perfectly correct one; and that M. Renan himself afterwards (p. 333) quotes the parable of the Pharisee and Publican as genuine. The instance he gives of the attempt of S. Luke to reconcile conflicting accounts is (iv. 16) the teaching in the synagogue at Nazareth. S. Luke's narrative relates, as is clear from the context, to an occurrence of which the other Evangelists had given no account at all; nor in their accounts of the subsequent visit to Nazareth, is there any conflict that requires reconciliation. Again, how does S. Luke soften the passages that might tell against a high idea of our Lord's divinity? The answer is (iii. 23), the first verse of the genealogy, "ut putabatur, filius Joseph." How this is a softening of S. Matthew's statement, taken with the context, no one will be able to see, until M. Renan is more explicit. He refers also to the omission by S. Luke, of Matthew xxiv. 36—the text about the ignorance of the day of judgment; but as S. Luke leaves out four-fifths of what occurs in S. Matthew, the inference as to his omission in any particular case is quite gratuitous. He "exaggerates the marvellous," why? Because he says Jesus returned in the power of the Spirit into Galilee (iv. 14), and mentions the Bloody Sweat, and the angel comforting our Lord (xxii. 43, 44). "He commits chronological errors;" for example (*note*), in what relates to Quirinius (Cyrinus), Lysanias, Theudas. M. Renan is quite aware that the difficulties he alludes to can be very well explained; but he never stops at any assertion for reasons of that sort. S. Luke is quite ignorant of Hebrew: why? Because (comp. Luke i. 31 with Matt. i. 21) he does not add the explanation of the name Jesus—"for He shall save His people from their sins." Truly a conclusive argument! S. Luke, writing for Greeks, has the good taste not to make a display of his knowledge of Hebrew names, he does not overwhelm us with *nabis*, and *sofers*, and *hazzans*, and *ouadis*, like M. Renan and others, hardly inferior to him in affectation; nor do the other Evangelists record expressions of our Lord in Aramaic, except on a few very special occasions. How do we prove the "exactitude" of S. Luke's devotion? By the fact (xxiii. 56) that the holy women rested on the Sabbath-day. Why is he particular about our Lord's fulfilling all the Jewish rites—he, who never mentions His going up to any feast, but one, before His Passion? Because he records the facts and details of the circumcision and purification. As for his being a democrat and "Ebionite exalté," M. Renan has a whole string of proofs. What are they? The parables of the unjust steward

and rich glutton, the beatitudes, the anecdote of our Lord's refusal to become a judge as to the distribution of an inheritance, and the words (xxii. 25), "When I sent you without purse and scrip and shoes, did you want anything? But they said nothing. Then said He unto them, But now, he that hath a purse let him take it, and likewise a scrip; and he that hath not, let him sell his coat, and buy a sword."

These specimens will probably be sufficient to satisfy our readers as to the value of the references with which the lower margin of M. Renan's pages is crowded. He carries the "fallacy of quotation and reference" to its utmost limits; happily, in this country at least, there will be a large number among those to whom his book would otherwise do the greatest harm, who will be easily able to correct his misrepresentations from their own memory. He sums up his account of S. Luke by calling him an "artiste divin," and saying that—

His Gospel is that which has the greatest charms to the reader: for to the incomparable beauty of the subject-matter common to all [the Evangelists], he adds an amount of art and composition, which singularly enhances the effect of the picture, *without seriously outraging truth*.*

M. Renan has a theory of his own about truthfulness, of which we may presently have to speak. Unfortunately, it is not that which is common among honest men; and his judgment of S. Luke, translated into ordinary language, places his authority on the very lowest level.

We have already said that M. Renan is unusually self-contradictory about S. John. It seems as if the Gospel of the beloved disciple was particularly disagreeable to him. Perhaps the divine majesty of our Blessed Lord, which is so strikingly set forth in its pages, has a disquieting effect upon M. Renan. Usually he proceeds on his way with the most unruffled, light-hearted gaiety; if he has any deep feelings on the subjects that pass before him, he makes it a part of his business to hide them under an expression of charming politeness and Parisian ease. But somehow he cannot bear the Word made flesh, the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world, the Teacher Who purged the temple at the very outset of His career, Who taught the necessity of the new birth, and spoke of the Son of Man, Who was to be lifted up as the serpent in the wilderness, and the condemnation of those who loved darkness rather than light, *because their deeds were evil*. It

* "Son évangile est celui dont la lecture a le plus de charme: car, à l'incomparable beauté du fond commun, il ajoute une part d'artifice et de composition qui augmente singulièrement l'effet du portrait, *sans nuire gravement à sa vérité*" (xiii.).

suits M. Renan to paint our Lord as a "charming young Rabbi," going about with a crowd of women and children, gay, joyous, indulgent, passing from one feast to another, winning every one by his beauty and grace, repeating moral aphorisms which he had gleaned from writers who had preceded him, and promising a paradise which was to be a delightful garden, in which the childlike happiness which his followers enjoyed here below was to be continued. Certainly this fantastic picture dissolves fast enough before the Gospel of S. John; and M. Renan is not quite perfect enough in his assumption of jaunty indifference, to conceal entirely his vexation at this. He seems to lose his temper, and betrays a sort of animosity against the beloved disciple. He imputes to him, as a motive for the composition of his Gospel, a desire to vindicate for himself a position not inferior to that elsewhere given to S. Peter. S. John, moreover has a spite against Judas Iscariot.* However, M. Renan will admit a certain amount of authority to S. John, especially as to the historical portions of his gospel. His treatment of him is exactly the reverse of his treatment of S. Matthew. S. Matthew was to be accepted as an authority about the discourses of our Lord; but his facts were to be disregarded. S. John is of no weight as to the discourses, but of great weight as to the facts. No one, M. Renan tells us, can attempt to make out a connected life of our Lord with the materials furnished by the four Gospels, without finding that the historical statements of S. John are of the utmost comparative value. In the same way, he says, no one can make such a narrative with any consistency and coherency, without setting aside the discourses in the fourth Gospel. As we have not thought fit to put before our readers passages in which M. Renan bestows a patronizing praise upon "the founder of Christianity," so we shall not sully these pages by the insertion of the blasphemous

* It would be curious to make out a complete list of the writers who have taken Judas Iscariot under their special protection. The late Dr. Whately was one of them. M. Renan goes beyond any that have preceded him. After mentioning the "legends," as he terms them, about his death,—which he attributes to a desire to apply to him the menaces of the Psalms against the traitorous friend,—he adds, "*Peut-être, retiré dans son champ de Hakeldama, Judas mena-t-il une vie douce et obscure, pendant que ses anciens amis conquerraient le monde et y semaient le bruit de son infamie. Peut-être aussi l'épouvantable haine qui pesait sur sa tête aboutit-elle à des actes violents, où l'on vit le doigt du ciel.*" "Perhaps, retiring to his 'field' of Hakeldama, Judas led there a life of peaceful obscurity, while his former friends were conquering the world and spreading about the report of his infamy. Perhaps, also, the terrible hatred that weighed upon his head led to violent acts, in which people saw the finger of God" (p. 438).

attacks which he makes upon the words of our Lord recorded by S. John. We shall only notice their character sufficiently to refute the argument by which they are supported. We must first, however, remark that just as M. Renan, in a passage already quoted, founds his acceptance of the "words of the Lord" in S. Matthew on his own intuitive perception of their genuineness and divine force and life, so his rejection of the discourses in S. John is mainly grounded upon subjective proof of the same kind. Not, however, entirely; for there are certain obvious differences between the discourses in the two Evangelists respectively, from which it may be argued that both sets cannot belong to the same speaker. This is perhaps about the most plausible argument in the whole book; quite a refreshing novelty, as it is not, at all events, the mere child of M. Renan's imagination.

The objection, then, is, that the discourses in S. John are full of abstract and doctrinal language, which contrasts strongly with the simple and practical moral tone of the sermons in S. Matthew. Moreover, the language of S. John is in complete harmony, according to M. Renan, with the intellectual state of Asia Minor at the close of the first century. He has even invented a "mysterious school of Ephesus," and some "great schools of Asia Minor," to whose influence he attributes the tone of S. John's Gospel, if indeed it does not, in great part, proceed from them, rather than from the Apostle after whom it is called. We need hardly say who is the creator of these schools; no one ever heard of them before; and as in S. Polycarp and others we possess some very early authors who would naturally have known of their existence if it was real, we must fear that learned men will hardly be credulous enough to believe in them even now. With regard to the discourses in S. John, however, the difficulty is only apparent, and, like others of the same class, only serves to throw fresh light upon the truth which it is supposed to impugn. We observe then, that even in S. Matthew and S. Luke, there are considerable differences between the discourses of our Lord at different times and in various places. The Sermon on the Mount is not like the charge to the Apostles in the tenth chapter of S. Matthew; neither of them is like the series of parables in the thirteenth chapter; nor again, to the teaching in the temple during holy week, and the closing prophecy on Mount Olivet. The difference between certain discourses in S. John and those that are preserved by S. Matthew, is only what was to be expected from the difference of the occasion, and of the persons to whom they were addressed.* In

* We may be allowed to refer to some admirable remarks on this point in

fact, the argument may be retorted against M. Renan. It may be fairly said that, considering all the difference between the circumstances and audiences in the respective cases, it would be an argument against the genuineness of the discourses in S. John if they were exactly like those in S. Matthew. A forger might have made them so, and betrayed himself by doing it. No Evangelist but S. John gives us the disputes of our Lord on points of doctrine with the Pharisees and priests at Jerusalem, such as those contained in the fifth chapter, and in parts of the seventh, eighth, ninth, and tenth. No one but S. John has preserved His teaching about the sacraments, such as is to be found in the conversation with Nicodemus, and in the long discussion in the synagogue at Capharnaum, after the miracle of the multiplication of the loaves. It is a great exaggeration to say that these discourses are full of abstract and metaphysical terms; here and there a few such terms as "light," "life," "world," &c., occur; but this language is not confined to S. John. Let any one open S. Matthew, and read the passage at the end of the eleventh chapter, beginning with v. 25. If he did not know he was reading S. Matthew, he might think it was a piece out of S. John. In fact, the very expressions and ideas of S. John occur in the other Evangelists. The passage in the fourth chapter about the sending of the Apostles to reap where others had laboured, and the fields being white for the harvest, is caught up in S. Matthew and S. Luke, in "the harvest is plenteous, but the labourers are few"; and "pray ye the Lord of the harvest that he send forth labourers into his harvest." S. John the Baptist's image of the bridegroom and the bride, in speaking of our Lord (John iii.), is repeated in S. Matthew in our Lord's answer about the fasting of the Baptist's disciples, and the contrast with His own. The parable of the Good Shepherd, in S. Luke, derives additional force and beauty from the discourses on the same image in S. John, delivered at the same period of our Lord's ministry, but to a different set of opponents. In S. Luke they are murmuring at His condescension to sinners; in S. John they are questioning His Divine mission. Another and a rather difficult passage in S. Luke xi. 33—36, about the light that is in us being darkness, is made easy by a reference to the passage in S. John about evil-doers hating to come to the light (iii. 20—21). The only long discourse in S. John that we have not specially mentioned, is that at the last supper, extending from chapter xiv.—xvii. There is

no parallel to this in the other Gospels, nor could it be expected that there should be; but the few words that S. Matthew and S. Luke give, as spoken at that time, are in perfect harmony with the discourse in S. John, and can easily be inserted in their proper place without any appearance of violent transition. Moreover M. Renan has cut the ground from beneath his own feet in acknowledging the historical facts of S. John as genuine, and particularly the account of the Passion. Every characteristic of the Gospel is there; the contrast between the Evangelists is nowhere more obvious. Nor can the discourses and the actions be separated. All sound modern criticism tends to establish the perfect unity of S. John's Gospel; and M. Renan will not be allowed, even by the German rationalists of the present day, any choice in the matter, except that between rejecting or accepting it as a whole.

If the principles which alone can justify M. Renan in his treatment of the four Gospels can thus be shown to have been gratuitously assumed, it follows, of course, that the whole fabric built upon them falls to the ground. We ought, perhaps, to notice a further assertion of M. Renan: that, after all, it is necessary to make a selection from the materials furnished by the Evangelists, on account of the contradictions that exist between the statements of one and those of another. They are, too, he tells us, sometimes at variance with other historians. This would not be the place to discuss at length the so-called contradictions between the several Evangelists; nor does M. Renan enter into the question at any length. It costs him less trouble to make a new gospel of his own than to reconcile apparently conflicting statements on particular points: in order to do that, he would have to embarrass himself with principles of selection which might fetter the freedom of his fancy. If he chose to follow S. Luke in one place and S. Matthew in another, readers might be so unreasonable as to ask for some consistent principle. The unsteady motion of the butterfly is said to be a provision of nature by which the insect is secured from danger. M. Renan, as long as he gives no reasons and lays down no rules of selection, is as safe from criticism as a butterfly from a bird. We must content ourselves with remarking on the childishness of thus ignoring the fact that there are but very few difficulties of any moment in the harmony of the Gospels, and that these difficulties, such as they are, would obviously vanish away if we knew the circumstances more completely. With regard to contradictions between the Gospels and the works of heathen writers, we greatly understate the case when we say that there

are none of such a nature as to make it, on simple grounds of reason, the most probable solution that the Gospels are wrong. If we notice a single instance in which M. Renan has condescended to give us a note of half a page to justify the assertions of his text, it is only that our readers may have a specimen of the contemptuous position which he assumes with regard to the criticism and learning of the day.

In his second chapter, M. Renan disposes in a summary way of the birth of our Lord at Bethlehem.—

The census of Quirinius, to which legend attributes the journey to Bethlehem, is at least ten years later than the year in which, according to Luke and Matthew, Jesus was born. The two Evangelists in effect make Jesus to be born under the reign of Herod.—(Matt. ii. 1, 19, 22; Luke i. 5.) Now the census of Quirinius did not take place until after the deposition of Archelaus, i. e. ten years after the death of Herod, the 37th year from the era of Actium—(Josephus, Ant. xviii. 13, 5; xviii. I., ii. 1.) The inscription by which it was formerly pretended to establish that Quirinius had levied two censuses is recognized as false (see Orelli, *Inscr. Lat.* No. 623, and the Supplement of Henzen in this number: Borghesi, *Fastes Consulaires* [yet unpublished] in the year 742). The census, in any case, would only be applied to the parts reduced to Roman provinces, and not to the tetrarchies.—P. 48, Eng. Trans.

Now, it is perfectly true that *one* inscription, at Venice, given by Muratori in his "Thesaurus Novus," is said now to have disappeared, and is doubted by Orelli and his continuator; but M. Renan ought to know that there is another, given by Sanclementi, which seems to fit no one but Quirinius, and speaks of his having been a *second* time in office in Syria.* But this is not all. M. Renan quietly passes by the proof on which the critics of the present day rest the hypothesis of a double census—a proof quite independent of the inscriptions. We will venture to say that dozens of schoolboys in Germany and England could answer his note without turning to a book to assist them. It is now many years since the essay of A. W. Zumpt, "*De Syria Romanorum provincia a Cesare Augusto ad Titum Vespasianum*," set the matter beyond reasonable doubt, at least as far as Quirinius is concerned. There may be difficulties as to the extension of the census to the dominion of Herod; but these do not amount to a reason for denying the plain assertion of S. Luke, who, as it appears from the Acts (v. 37) was quite aware of the later census, and indeed seems to allude to it as having been distinct from that made at the time of our Lord's birth, in the very words in which he mentions the latter, αὕτη ἡ ἀπογραφὴ πρώτη ἐγένετο ἡγεμονεύοντος τῆς

* The inscription is given by Patrizi in *Evangelia*, t. iii. p. 166.

Συρίας Κυρηναίου. We can hardly suppose M. Renan ignorant of all this. He goes on to say, with amazing coolness, "That which proves, besides, that the journey of the family of Jesus to Bethlehem is not historical, is the motive attributed to it. Jesus was not of the family of David (see chap. xv.)" We turn to the place indicated, in hopes of finding some proof of this assertion. There is nothing of the kind. He merely says that it appears that the family of David had been extinct for a long time: but he gives no evidence. If it had been extinct, how came the Jews not to know it?

This trick of pretending to discuss a critical question, and then leaving without notice the principal argument of his opponents, is quite in keeping with the childishness that pervades the whole of M. Renan's attack on Christianity. He reminds us of some amiable chess-players, who, on the plea of inexperience, stipulate that we shall give them a queen and a castle, and let them move twice to our once. M. Renan says in effect, "Grant me that there is nothing supernatural, that miracles and prophecies cannot be, and that I may deal as I like with the Four Gospels, and then I will undertake to produce an account of the life of Jesus that shall be in keeping with my Pantheistic notions." And yet, after all, he does not succeed. He gives us an idyllic romance, which to any sensible person will no more answer the purposes of history than a watch without works will tell us the time of day. If any one could put himself into a state of perfect indifference as to the subject, and forget all criticism and all history, he might think it a pretty performance. For ourselves, this mincing, scented, *petit maître* style of writing about our Blessed Lord makes us almost regret the broad, coarse, vulgar abuse of the infidels of the last century. *Malim hercule C. Gracchi impetum, aut L. Crassi maturitatem, quam calamistros Mæcenatis aut tinnitus Gallionis.* We seem to be reading the *Thalia* of a new Arius. Then, M. Renan is a great adept at that not very ingenuous way of putting forward an odious statement or insinuation of which some writers in England have lately given us more than one example. It consists in the skilful use of qualifying terms—*peut-être, on ignore si, on peut supposer, tout porte à croire*, prefixed to assertions for which there is not the slightest possible foundation.

We must deal, however, with one more serious charge. M. Renan, as our readers are already aware, belongs to that school of critics, who, unable to deny the plain words of the Evangelists, explain a number of the sayings and doings of our Blessed Lord and His Apostles by the hateful theory of accommodation—an explanation which we shall venture to call

the most revolting and detestable of all. Let us hear M. Renan:—

An absolute conviction, or rather the enthusiasm which freed him from even the possibility of a doubt, shrouded all these boldnesses (*hardiesses*). We little understand, with our cold and scrupulous natures, how any one can be so entirely possessed by the idea of which he has made himself the apostle. To the deeply earnest (*sérieuses*) races of the West, conviction means sincerity to oneself. But sincerity to oneself has not much meaning to Oriental peoples, little accustomed to the subtleties of a critical spirit. Honesty and imposture are words which, in our rigid consciences, are opposed as two irreconcilable terms. In the East, they are connected by numberless subtle links and windings (*il y a de l'un à l'autre mille fuites et mille détours*). The authors of the apocryphal books (of "Daniel" and of "Enoch," for example), men highly exalted (*exaltés*), in order to aid their cause, committed without a shadow of scruple an act which we should term a fraud. The literal truth (*la vérité matérielle*) has little value to the Oriental: he sees everything through the medium of his ideas, his interests, and his passions.

History is impossible, if we do not fully admit that there are many standards of sincerity. All great things are done through the people: now we can only lead the people by adapting ourselves to its ideas. The philosopher who, knowing this, isolates and fortifies himself in his integrity (*se retranche dans sa noblesse*) is highly praiseworthy. But he who takes humanity with its illusions, and seeks to act with it and upon it, cannot be blamed. Cæsar knew well that he was not the son of Venus; France would not be what it is, if it had not for a thousand years believed in the Holy Ampulla of Rheims. It is easy for us, who are so powerless (*impuissants que nous sommes*), to call this falsehood, and, proud of our timid honesty, to treat with contempt the heroes who have accepted the battle of life under other conditions. When we have effected with our scruples what they accomplished by their falsehoods, we shall have the right to be severe upon them. At least we must make a marked distinction between societies like our own, where everything takes place in the full light of reflection, and simple and credulous communities (*sociétés naïves et crédules*) in which the beliefs that have governed ages have been born. Nothing great has been established which does not rest upon a legend. The only culprit in such cases is the humanity that is willing to be deceived.—Pp. 186, 187, English Translation.

Unless we are much mistaken, the feelings of any Christian reader of this passage will be far more shocked by it than by the blunt and Occidental plain-speaking of "Hanan" and "Kaïapha," as recorded by S. Matthew, "Sir, we have remembered that that seducer said." But on this subject we shall not enter. At all events, the readers of M. Renan will know from it with whom they have to do. It can only be a compliment to such a writer to say that, although he appears by birth to belong to the "profoundly serious" races of the

West, he has learned from the imaginary heroes whom he so much admires how to lead people—if they will follow him—by adapting himself to their ideas. His references might be supposed to indicate passages that support the assertions of his text: his great parade of learning and Rabbinical erudition might be imagined, according to popular notions, to imply that his researches have been profound, and that their results are highly important in their bearing on the subject of his work. Those who have verified these points for themselves will report that M. Renan has "taken humanity with its illusions" in this respect. We are far from denying that he may be a learned man; but we deny that his book is the fair result of his learning. It costs but little industry to discover the trick of his quotations from the Gospels; it requires but ordinary erudition to detect his frequent neglect of the most established results of criticism, and the shallowness of his dictatorial decisions on points still unsettled. Philo Judeus and the Talmud lie more out of the path of ordinary students; but even as to these M. Renan has been found out. "*Le seul coupable en pareil cas, c'est l'humanité qui veut être trompée.*" And, to turn to another point, how many among the thousands of his readers have been warned that, as Mgr. Dupanloup has said of writers of his class, he uses their language, and does not mean by it what they do. They will read, in the very first line of his dedication, of a soul reposing in the bosom of God: they will meet frequently, in the pages that follow, with the mention of the Divine Essence: they will find the expression "Son of God" applied to Him to whom they believe it to belong naturally and of right: they will find this apostrophe at the end of the history of the Passion:—

Thy work is completed; thy Divinity is established . . . Henceforth, beyond the reach of frailty, thou shalt be present, from the height of thy Divine peace, in the infinite consequences of thy acts. . . . A thousand times more living, a thousand times more loved, than during the days of thy pilgrimage here below, thou wilt become to such a degree the corner-stone of humanity that to tear thy name from this world would be to shake it to its foundations. Between thee and God men will no longer distinguish!*

—English Translation, p. 291.

* "Ton œuvre est achevée, ta divinité est fondée . . . désormais hors des attentes de la fragilité, tu assisteras, du haut de la paix divine, aux conséquences infinies de tes actes. . . . Mille fois plus vivant, mille fois plus aimé, depuis ta mort que durant les jours de ton passage ici bas, tu deviendras à tel point la pierre angulaire de l'humanité, qu'arracher ton nom de ce monde serait l'ébranler jusqu'aux fondements. Entre toi et Dieu, on ne distinguera pas" (p. 426).

It is their own fault if they are deceived. M. Renan is condescending to their weakness, in order to lead them on to the truth. Jesus is the Son of God, because "he has advanced religion as no other has done; or probably will ever be able to do." What is the "God" of which M. Renan speaks?

The paltry discussions of scholasticism, the dryness of spirit of Descartes, the deep-rooted irreligion of the eighteenth century, by lessening God, and by limiting Him, in a manner, by the exclusion of everything which is not His very self, have stifled in the heart of modern rationalism all fertile ideas of the Divinity. If God, in fact, is a personal being outside of us, he who believes himself to have peculiar relations with God is a "visionary;" and as the physical and physiological sciences have shown us that all supernatural visions are illusions, the logical theist finds it impossible to understand the great beliefs of the past. Pantheism, on the other hand, in suppressing the Divine personality, is as far as it can be from the living God of the ancient religions.—P. 81, Eng. Trans.

Here, then, is what M. Renan means by God. Moreover, he indicates plainly enough, in a passage already quoted, that he does not accept the definition of man as a compound of two substances, nor the "theistical dogma of the immortality of the soul." Souls are not immortal; they are not distinct from bodies; there is no personal God; He is not a being outside of us; He is "limited" if he is distinguished from everything which is not Himself. The apostrophe we have quoted has not even a Socinian sense: it is a simple play of language and Oriental accommodation to the prejudices of the vulgar. All that awaits us is, that perhaps "the last term of progress, after millions of ages, may bring the absolute consciousness of the universe, and, in this consciousness, the awakening again of all that has lived." Till then there is nothing but a long sleep, which M. Renan calls the "divine repose," the "bosom of God."

Our last remark upon the work before us must have reference to the one merit which has been most confidently claimed for it. It may be an uncritical book, and an unfair book, besides having those other odious qualities which will move the feelings of Christians to resentment and indignation. But it is supposed, at all events, to be a "perfect work of art." If by this be meant that, looked upon as a mere work of fiction, describing the career of an imaginary personage, it is perfect in its kind, we must say that it is difficult for a Catholic to put himself in that indifferent state of mind which would be requisite for the formation of such a judgment. But M. Renan does not mean it for a pure work of fiction. He means it for the explanation of a Character that has left deeper traces in

the history of the world than any other before or since: he means it for the analysis of a career which has guided the course of the human race through subsequent ages. This being the case, it can be nothing but an imposture and a failure, unless it gives an intelligible account of "the founder of Christianity" in connection with His influence upon mankind. It must be judged by reason and philosophy, not by the sentimental standard of the readers of "*Les Misérables*" and "*Salamambo*." M. Renan denies the supernatural altogether, and tells us that "*le développement des produits vivants est partout le même.*"* The Christian system, then, must have grown up naturally and spontaneously, according to rigid law and consequence, out of the "powerful personality" of its Founder. To us, as Catholics, there is no discord and want of harmony, as we look on the one hand at the Catholic Church and her work in the world during eighteen centuries, and on the other to the character, and words, and deeds of her Divine Founder, as they are recorded for us in the Gospel history. Jesus Christ has lived in His Church, age after age, and, working in her and through her, He has conquered, renovated, and regenerated human society by the heavenly life that He has breathed into all the elements that compose it. He has given to those who believe in Him power to become the sons of God. The grain of mustard-seed has become the greatest of trees, and the fowls of the air have taken shelter in the branches of it. With our faith in our Divine Lord, in the power of His grace, the tenderness of His care for the Church, the wisdom of His institutions, the certainty of His promises, it would be more of a difficulty that she should not have done more, than that she should have done what she has, could we not trace to the unfaithfulness and frailty of the human agents to whom divine power has been intrusted, whatever there is of incompleteness as to her influence on the world. But we find in the Life, the Character, the Person of our Blessed Lord the germ and principle of everything that is so beautiful and divine in the unearthly history of His spouse. We cannot expect that M. Renan should be otherwise than blind to these beauties and glories; for to a philosophy such as his the noonday sun shines in vain, and the air around him may ring with the songs of angels, and yet he will not hear. But the common intelligence of mankind is not yet so weakened or so overclouded as not to detect the absurdity which its unconscious author presents to the

* "The development of living products is everywhere the same."

world as the crowning and exquisite triumph of reflection and genius. Saved by his lack of faith from the blasphemy of the Pharisees, M. Renan is far less logical than they were. He would have us think that the evil spirit has been cast out and the possessed man changed into an angel—not by the power of Beelzebub, the prince of the devils, but by an engaging person, fanatical enthusiasm, exaggerated requirements, false miracles, and "*féconds malentendus*."

We conclude, therefore, that this much-vaunted book has no such scientific value as to make it worthy even of serious refutation. It is an insult, not a blow, to the Catholic faith. There is no reason why half a dozen more such volumes should not be written, giving an entirely different character to the same history, and arranging its events in a perfectly different order, with just the same amount of probability, and no greater divergence from the statements of unquestionable authorities. M. Renan may have any number of successors; and, certainly, if the reception of his volume at the hands of the learned is not encouraging to those who might be disposed to imitate him, its fortune has been great enough, in less respectable quarters, to invite a repetition of the experiment. It has caused an unexampled sensation, and run through a large number of editions. It has been translated into almost every European language. These are results sufficiently gratifying to an adventurer, who has lifted his hand against what Christians hold dearest and most sacred. They are saddening enough for those who think, first of all, of the loss to souls that may follow upon them. The mischief of a book like this is, unfortunately, far from being commensurate to its critical value or logical power: its showiness of style, its assumption of learning and authority, will catch many a mind already burning with a secret wish for some food of this kind, and, it may be, lead finally astray many a soul that longs to be emancipated from the gentle yoke of Christian doctrine, and the pure teaching of Gospel morality. Its great attraction is, that it gives something positive; that it does not discuss, and dispute, and demolish, but presents a consecutive narrative and a complete picture. The picture is a lie—but it is a picture still; and so it will engage the attention of thousands who cannot comprehend an argument, and have no patience for the doubtful conclusions and imperfect results of legitimate criticism. M. Renan's book is a romance, a libel, and a blasphemy; but still it is not a set of dissertations, but a *Life*.

The Catholic Life of Jesus Christ, as far as it exists apart from the four inspired narratives of the Evangelists, is a

picture drawn in the hearts of His millions of worshippers by the great Teacher of all truth,—using, besides His own secret influences, the ordinary means of prayer, meditation, reading, and instruction; the solemn services, festivals, and seasons of the Christian year; and the countless devotions and ritual celebrations which have sprung up in the loving heart of His Church, as the natural issues of her feeling towards her Divine Lord. It is a floating image, formed by the meeting of a thousand beautiful rays. Each of its great features has become the object of some special devotion, as the hearts of individuals are drawn to the Hidden Life in the womb of Mary, the Holy Infancy, the Life at Nazareth, the Public Life, the Blessed Sacrament, the Passion, or the Life in Glory. The whole of it absorbs the constant thought and affection of thousands of saints on earth; and the Church spends her year in setting before her children one after another of its mysteries, in rehearsing and commenting on its actions, and in the daily celebration of the August Sacrifice that concentrates its lessons, repeats its crowning oblation, and scatters far and wide its blessings and its merits over the living and the dead. But if we ask ourselves for a written life of Jesus Christ—one that may be a household book with Christians of all classes—a simple and short narrative, at once popular and scientific, that would give the men of this generation the true results of genuine and orthodox criticism, and allow them to enjoy what light can be gained from the boasted progress of knowledge on collateral matters, without shocking their faith or scaring their devotion,—we are obliged to answer, that the Catholics of our time have not yet such a work to show. Here, then, we may venture to say, is a kind of reparation to our Divine Lord, which literature and science may be said to owe. The instinct of Catholics has already felt, with regard to the book of M. Renan, that it is, as we have called it, rather an insult that they must atone for, than a serious attack that they are called on to repel; and thousands of acts of reparation, public and private, have already been spontaneously made for this outrage on the Divine Person and the Sacred Humanity of our Redeemer. May that reparation be multiplied a thousandfold, till the wanton blow of an apostate has turned, through the devotion of Catholics, to a great increase of the glory of Jesus Christ! The children of the Church have countless ways of doing this; nor will He who praised the alms of the widow reject even the humblest or the simplest action that is offered as an atonement to His honour. The insult has come under the name of science and criticism: let science and criticism do their part to make up for it in

their own way. Their work may not be so valuable in the eyes of Heaven as a single devout prayer, an act of mortification or love, a rash judgment suppressed, a deed of hidden mercy, a cup of cold water given to a little one for His sake. These are things that belong to a higher order, and they honour the Life of Jesus by imitating it, not by depicting it. But all gifts are from Him, and all may be used in His service : all may, by His blessing, be made in their own way to advance His earthly glory ; and surely not least of all, those that may make Him better known, and more tenderly loved, wherever there are souls to know Him and hearts to love Him.

ART. VI.—THE SANTIAGO CATASTROPHE AND ITS CRITICS.

1. *Santiago : La Vérité de la Catastrophe.* Paris : Dillet. 1864.
2. *The Saturday Review*, February 6th, 1864.
3. *The Spectator*, ditto.
4. *The John Bull*, ditto.
5. *The Church Times*, ditto.
6. *The Standard*, ditto.

IF the hypothesis of a supernatural agency be, with all religious minds, the ready solution of facts, whether in the physical or moral universe, which do not admit of being referred to any known laws, much more obviously does that hypothesis suggest the explanation of phenomena which are in direct contradiction to such laws. Among the latter may be reckoned the deep and unconquerable antipathy with which the Blessed Mother of God is almost universally regarded by heretical and infidel free-thinkers. Our Lady combines in herself all those qualities which, according to general consent and experience, have the greatest natural tendency to enlist human instincts and sympathies on the side of one who possesses them. She is, in the first place, of that sex which, far from provoking hatred, is apt rather to inspire a chivalrous enthusiasm in its defence. She is, according to any idea which can be formed of her by those who think of her at all, the perfect counterpart of our notions of the beautiful, elevated by those of the virtuous and of the pure. In this idea that also of amiability is included, or, in other words, of the loving, and the loveable. These attributes, naturally

engaging and attractive in any one, are in her exhibited in the relation which, of all others, enhances that natural attractiveness—the relation of a Mother; and it certainly ought not to weaken, at any rate, a Christian's appreciation of such a relation, to know that the correlative of this Mother is his own Lord and Redeemer. We say that no one who believes in the Blessed Virgin at all, can believe less than all this, for we have expressed, not the dogmatic faith of the Church, but only that idea of the subject which is accordant with the dictates of the commonest natural piety. Yet it is nevertheless a fact that there are human beings in the world, and they too especially apt to charge Catholics with the want of tenderness and natural affection, who at once believe in the Blessed Virgin and hate her. They are not merely cold and indifferent about her, they positively hate her with an active, energetic hatred. They cannot endure to see her loved, or to hear her eulogized. They can be eloquent about an actress or a singer; in their better moods they can even rise to sentiment on the subject of a Sister of Charity; but in the Blessed Virgin, neither the gentleness of a Woman, nor the tenderness of a Mother, nor the charity of a Benefactress, nor the dignity of a Queen, can evoke one flower of rhetoric, or kindle one spark of chivalrous feeling. Her name is put aside, and you are only made conscious of her existence by an outburst of blustering fury whenever the occasion for it is suggested by some manifestation of her power, or some demonstration in her honour.

We are here, of course, referring to something very different from the reluctance which piously disposed Protestants, and even some of those who are unwilling to be called Protestants at all, are apt to exhibit in speaking to the honour of our Lady. For much of this we can make allowance; with some of it even sympathize. Many a Protestant really in his heart believes that the Catholic devotion to Mary is derogatory to her Divine Son; and his dislike of it is mainly founded in zeal for Him. But, to set down the phraseology of the *Times*, or the *Saturday Review*, on the subject, for instance, of the Immaculate Conception, to any special jealousy for our Lord's honour, would indeed be the very Quixotism of charity.

We repeat then, that this intense hatred of the Mother of God is not only a phenomenon, but a portent; not only a marvel, but a mystery. We hardly know of anything which so vividly realizes the idea of satanic agency. We could fancy a saint detecting one of these defamers of Mary, by a sort of divine sagacity, and shuddering at his approach as an ordinary man would recoil from a serpent or scorpion. For in truth, the avowed hatred of the Mother of God is about the

ultimate point of the devil's policy, at least in England. The direct defamation of our Lord Himself would be too strong a measure; it would not "go down." But the Blessed Virgin is a fair and popular object of attack; and our cunning enemy knows full well that her Divine Son is too near her side to escape the point of the dart which he aims at her.

It might have been expected, on grounds of experience and analogy, that the explicit declaration of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception would, in one way or another, bring out into active vigour and unrestrained expression, these latent elements of heretical spleen. For not only does that dogma involve our Lady's cardinal privilege, as compared with all other descendants of Adam, but when she and "her seed" were marked off immediately after the Fall, as the eternal antagonists of the Tempter and "his seed," the especial prerogative which cleared her from participation in the penalty of Eve's transgression would seem to have been foreshadowed in some peculiar manner, as the ground, and as it were, irritating cause of that antagonism. That, at any rate, it has been such in point of fact, must be evident to all attentive observers of modern controversy; and one more proof of this mysterious connection between the dogma in question and the popular antipathy to our Blessed Lady, has been afforded by the malignant sagacity with which the "Serpent and his seed" have fastened upon the recent catastrophe at Santiago, springing as it did from a public celebration in honour of Mary conceived without sin, as a means of "making capital" for the purpose of bringing that most holy and blessed truth into public disrepute. Before proceeding, however, to illustrate this fact by reference to the quarters in which it has been made conspicuous, we shall place on record the circumstances of that lamentable occurrence, with the view of showing the extent to which they have been perverted into a favourable occasion of clap-trap controversy.

Our readers are well aware that the symbol "Mary conceived without sin," has for generations been the watchword of pious affection in Spain and her dependencies. In those, as in other parts of the Church, but in those more especially, the definition which has distinguished our own times, did not introduce the belief of our Lady's exemption from the effects of the primeval curse, but only put the seal of the Church's dogmatic sanction upon a truth which the pious instincts of her children had for ages anticipated, in the way, not merely of a theory, but of a practical and irrepressible conviction. At Santiago, where the laws of our hemisphere are reversed, and November falls in spring-time, the beautiful devotion of

the Month of Mary is converted into a kind of preparatory festival terminating on the day which, from a remote antiquity, the Church has set apart in honour of our Lady's Conception, and if of her Conception, then surely of her Conception without stain of Original Sin; since the fact of being brought into existence under a curse would be no subject of festive rejoicing. On the late fatal occasion, it was resolved to wind up a month of more than usual devotion by a festival of more than usual magnificence. As it is impossible for every church in a Catholic city to give equal effect to such celebrations, one generally takes the lead in concentrating upon itself the chief external attractions whereby honour is done to the occasion in the eyes of the devout people, whether such church be a cathedral, or one especially devoted to the Saint or to the Mystery, or in any other way marked out as the fittest to give effect to the solemnity. On the memorable 8th December, 1863, the church thus selected at Santiago was that of the *Compania*, which, as its name imports, was erected by the Company of Jesus before their expulsion from South America in the last century, but which has since become a parochial church in the hands of the secular clergy. It has been said, on the authority of a French journal, that there are no Jesuits at present in South America. This, we rejoice to find, is a mistake; but the error in no way affects the argument against those who have sought, by insinuation at least, if not by open charge, to entangle the Jesuits in the odium of the late disaster. The great celebration of the Festival was reserved for the evening. Long before the time appointed for the devotion, the church, which was of considerable size, was filled; and many who came to the doors were excluded for want of room. Like many of the foreign churches, it was so arranged that the males occupied one side and the females the other, being separated by a strong iron screen, extending the whole length of the building. It contained no seats for the people, but, as we believe is the case also in Spain, the female part of the congregation, at any rate, sat or knelt on carpets strewn on the ground. The number of the women present greatly exceeded that of the men; in the proportion, as would appear, of two thousand to three or four hundred. The church was splendidly adorned, and brilliantly lighted; lines of drapery ran from end to end, with rows of small lamps fed by parafin oil, a substance, as is well known, of the most inflammable and explosive nature. The dome, which arose towards the further end of the church, was also decorated with drapery and flowers, and radiant with lights. But the sanctuary, of course, presented the greatest attraction. A

colossal image of our Lady of the Immaculate Conception surmounted the altar, at the feet of which was placed a semicircle of gas jets to represent the moon described in the Apocalypse. Drapery, flowers, and lights, abounded in the neighbourhood of the altar. The preparations were completed soon after six o'clock, an hour before the appointed time, with the exception only of lighting up the semicircle at our Lady's feet, which was reserved for the last. A few minutes before seven o'clock, an attendant proceeded from the sacristy with a lighted taper, which soon gave shape and lustre to the mimic moon, hitherto obscured. On a sudden, one of the jets of gas (probably on account of some hidden fracture) burst forth into a flame, which instantly caught the drapery of the image. A young man who was near the sanctuary, rushed forward and tore down the burning drapery, at the same time forcibly extinguishing the gas on the side of the accident. The restless element, disappointed of its exit on the one side, avenged itself by a violent escape on the other, which immediately set fire to another mass of drapery. This disaster was irremediable. In less than a minute the whole sanctuary was in a blaze. The flames, fanned by a draught of wind, rushed forward and mounted to the dome. The wreaths of roses were converted into wreaths of fire. Then it caught the sides of the church, and ran like lightning along the cornices; in a quarter of an hour the whole building was a mass of flame. The sight of the sanctuary on fire produced a panic; the women rushed in a body to the front doors, which unfortunately opened inwards, and therefore did not on this occasion open at all, since an enormous weight pressed incessantly upon them. Meanwhile, the paraffin oil, or "liquid hydrogen," released from a thousand lamps by the dissolution of the cords which sustained them, rained showers of fire upon the heads of the imprisoned multitude. The rest may be imagined. All but a very few were either burned, suffocated, or crushed to death; and the next morning, Santiago, like a second Bethlehem, was a scene of weeping and great mourning; husbands bewailing the loss of their wives, brothers of their sisters, mothers of their children, and children of their parents, "*nolentes consolari, quia non sunt.*"

Where were the *clergy* of the church during this awful scene? will be asked by some in curiosity, and by others in insolence and contempt. We will answer the question. Two priests only were present in the evening, together with a preacher, who was a stranger in the place, and several clerks in minor orders. One of the priests rushed into the church, and fainted at the entrance. He was instantly carried through

the sacristy to a house in the neighbourhood. The other (Ugarte), seeing that corporal aid was wholly out of the question, stood at the door of the sacristy and pronounced a general absolution upon the dying members of his flock. He could have done nothing else, and he could have done nothing better. Three or four of the younger clergy were *burned to death* in trying to assist the sufferers. It has been said that the priests closed the sacristy door that they might save the valuables. This is contradicted by the French Catholic journals: from them we learn that the sacristy door was open and afforded an escape to "several."* The sacred objects, they add, were rescued, *not* by the priests, but by a young layman (named Guevara), as a voluntary act of heroic devotion. No sooner was the news of the fire spread abroad, than the Archbishop and all the clergy of the town repaired to the spot to render assistance, though it was too late to save any lives.

We have thus given the recital which, after clearing the accounts from head-quarters of all the rubbish of contradiction, exaggeration, and inflammatory comment, the *Monde* and the *Journal des Villes et des Campagnes* have left on record, and which will be found well put together in the little French tract, entitled "*La Vérité de la Catastrophe de Santiago.*" One difficulty, indeed, remains, which is but imperfectly removed by these accounts; viz., how it was that more women were not saved, either through the sacristy or through the door by which the men escaped. But in a letter from Chili we find it incidentally stated, that the women had no access either to the sacristy or to the men's side of the iron screen, except by passing in front of the altar, where was the very *source and chief seat of the fire*; and it is added, that some of them did, in the first instance, face the flames, and so make their escape. If such were the internal arrangement of the church, the whole occurrence becomes most intelligible; otherwise, we may suppose that the great body of women rushed spontaneously to the door by which they had entered,

* The *Spectator* of Feb. 13 says that "the fact" of the sacristy door having been closed by the priests, "*proves itself*"; for there was no rush to this door." Now, no one questions that the door was open by which the men made their escape, and yet there was no "rush" of women to this door either; while the door to which they did press forward was confessedly closed. Some observations on this circumstance follow in the text of our article; but it is well worthy of observation how childish are the fallacies which will delude even an able man, if they recommend a conclusion so, *à priori*, probable to him, as that in a priest who was not "bred a freeman," i.e., a Protestant, "human nature" is "demoralized," "all compassion, all feeling, all sense of awe" "utterly extinguished," and "the reason and the instincts of nature" "crushed down."

and that by the time they discovered this exit to be impracticable, the conflagration had so fearfully spread as to preclude all access to the other doors. Our attention has also been directed to a letter addressed to the *Era* newspaper by Mr. Boucicault, the actor, on the precautions suited for theatres to meet the case of fire. He says that the provision of additional doors to open on such a contingency is of no service whatever, as it has been universally found that the panic-stricken victims press forward by an irresistible instinct each to the door by which he or she had originally entered; and that, in their state of temporary madness, it is found quite impossible to direct their attention to any other mode of escape. He considers, therefore, that the really beneficial resource would be to have the means of enormously enlarging, on occasion, the doors and passages through which the audience enter. We had no idea, before reading Mr. Boucicault's letter, that such is the generally observed fact; but if it be, it will afford a third means for satisfactorily explaining what appears to be the most perplexing circumstance in the whole of this calamitous affair.

At all events, the conduct of the priests is in no kind of way mixed up with the question: for the difficulty applies fully as much to the door by which the men escaped as to the door of the sacristy; and (we suppose) not even the writers of the anti-Catholic press will maintain that the priests went round and closed the men's door, that they might gratify the "malignant spite at women" (see *Spectator* of Feb. 6th), generated by the "institution of celibacy." No charge can, in fact, be made against them with the slightest plausibility, with the single exception of the blame which, on the score of prudence, would undoubtedly attach to them, if they had been directly responsible for an adornment of their church so perilous to life as that described. But it appears, even from the most prejudiced accounts, that on the evening in question they had intrusted this work to a stranger priest from Italy; and nothing is more probable than that their eyes were not opened to the full extent of the danger, till it was too late to make a change without incurring a risk apparently even greater than that which they ran in allowing the decorations to remain. Be this as it may, it is clear that whatever blame may justly be imputed to them, it does not attach to them in their capacity of *priests*. They did not expose their flock to the danger for the sake of some supposed ecclesiastical interest. It was a danger, moreover, which they shared with their congregation, and of which neither priests nor people—as appears from the result—had sufficient appreciation. We have, however, no wish to exonerate them from such discredit

as they may fairly deserve for their improvidence ; but, on the contrary, would earnestly hope that all zealous lovers of the beauty of God's house might take warning by their example ; and while not abating a whit of their most reasonable desire to make the church at least as attractive in external appearance as the houses of the great and the resorts of the world, would keep Santiago continually before their eyes, as a providential admonition against modes of decoration which, upon the ordinary principles of calculation, might be apt to lead to as terrible a catastrophe,—terrible enough in itself, but infinitely more so on account of the blasphemies and falsehoods of which it has been made the occasion. How it came to pass, indeed, that the three or four hundred men who were present in the church contrived, as appears to have been the case, to save their lives without rendering any assistance to the female sufferers, is, we think, a very legitimate subject of curiosity,* although one which it has not suited the purpose of the infidel critics to start ; but if one of the priests were disabled—if the other did his duty (one account even says that he was burned to death)—and if three out of the four other clerics connected with the church (as appears by all the accounts) perished in the flames,—we think all reasonable men will admit that the clerical body, at any rate, made more than sufficient expiation for such amount of imprudence as is fairly chargeable upon it.

Now, then, let us see what use has been made of this calamity in a controversial point of view. In the first place, complicity in it has been almost universally attributed to the Jesuits, because the Jesuits (as the French proverb says of the absent, and perhaps for that very reason) are “always in the wrong.” Persons who know, or might have known, that the Jesuits have nothing upon earth now to do with the church of the *Compania*, or who, at any rate, were afraid of compromising their character as historians by broadly stating the facts, have resorted to the convenient rhetorical figure of insinuation. Thus the *Saturday Review*, which, if it does not know better, ought to be ashamed of writing upon the subject without ascertaining the truth of the matter, quietly prefixes the epithet “Jesuit” to the church, whose clergy it describes as “dead to all human sympathies except the unmanly instinct of self-preservation.” This is, anyhow, keeping to the safe side ; because it is certain that the church in question was *once* a “Jesuit church.” We very strongly believe that the

* The *Tablet* of February 20th contains a letter from an eye-witness of the catastrophe to his son in North America, which declares that the police prevented assistance being rendered to the sufferers. This, if true, would tend to solve some difficulties.

Saturday Review knew it was not so now, because, had it believed the contrary, we do not think it would have let the Jesuits off quite so easily. But the proper, and, indeed, obvious construction of the words, "the Jesuit church," is that the church is actually at this time administered by Jesuits; and this impression will give a most telling effect to the character assigned in the same paragraph to the clergy as "dead to human feelings, &c."

The same convenient τόπος of insinuation has been resorted to by other journals to make out that the priests did actually, of malice prepense, set fire to the church. Considering that the same accounts affirm that they derived great revenues from it, the two assertions could hardly with any decency be made together; since, otherwise, it must be concluded by logical sequence that for a clergyman to burn the church and congregation whence he derives his maintenance, and that, too, at the risk of his own life, is the natural instinct of ecclesiastical avarice. No matter; any slander against the priesthood can be proved by the logic of Protestant controversy. Mr. Rogers, who, as the papers inform us, has lately been appointed by the bishop of London to confute the "popish recusants" in Islington, made use of the following argument in his case against the Jesuits:—"Either," he said in effect, "the Jesuits have been excluded from Santiago, or they have not. If they have not, they were concerned with the burning of the church; if they have, it shows what a set of scoundrels they must have been."* In somewhat the same way, other writers who are determined that the priests of the church must be villains, have tried to make out the charge of avarice as not inconsistent with such an act of incendiarism. But feeling the logical difficulty, they make the one charge openly, and suggest the other; knowing very well that the public, especially the religious public, is not a "reasoning animal," and will fancy somehow that both charges might be sustained at once. "The priests, of course, are greedy of power and of gain because they are priests; and it is very evident," the critics go on to say, "that they caused this conflagration at all events by their carelessness. But if they caused it at all, no matter how." Go all lengths, then, O ye veracious guides of the people, and say that they caused it absolutely; suppress the qualifications, and imply the worst.

The *Saturday Review*, however, and the other leaders of the "intellectual" press are wiser in their generation, because they address a class of readers less easily duped. They will not repeat such vulgar calumnies, they even make a show of

* *North London News* of Feb. 20.

fairness by admitting that "certain allowances are to be made for the excitement under which the local accounts were written, for party prejudices," &c. Well, then, if so, upon what substantial basis do their inferences rest? How much is true, how much false, how much exaggerated? This they do not tell us, but go on to assume the *most* unfavourable hypothesis as the groundwork of their conclusions. In dealing with the facts they are all fairness; in their comments on them they imply the truth of those very allegations which they affect to regard as unproved. What else can be the meaning of such phraseology as the following?

After making the largest allowance for these considerations, *there is quite enough remaining to stamp eternal disgrace on a system which must be directly charged with the guilt of this crime: for crime it is.* Ugarte, whose name is destined to an *immortality of infamy*, only exaggerates the vices of the system which he represents; because, in a community in which the deformity of barbarism is scarcely concealed by a thin varnish of civilization, the evils of mixed blood perpetuate the worst atrocities of *Spanish cruelty and Indian sensuality*. . . . The Virgin's Post-office is not so much a thing to be laughed at, as an *offence against social order*.—*Saturday Review*, Feb. 6.

The "Virgin's post-office," as it is called, has been admitted, even by the most prejudiced of the narrators, to be nothing more than a box at the church-door for receiving requests for prayers through our Lady's intercession, which, according to the very beautiful practice of southern countries, are not conveyed, as among us, in the form of applications to the priest or to a confraternity, but in that of direct addresses to our Lady herself. One shameless writer has asserted, without a shadow of proof, that this box was a receptacle of scandalous communications to the priests. The *Saturday Review* does not inform us which of these interpretations it receives; but if it be the former, to talk of such a practice as an "offence against social order" is neither more nor less than arrant nonsense.

The facts of the whole case supply a striking comment upon the manner in which historical calumnies are preserved and propagated for generations. A century hence—should the world last so long, and England be not yet converted—some Exeter Hall orator of the day will "point a moral" against the Jesuits by referring to their share in the "Santiago tragedy." He will confirm his statement from the newspapers of the present day, and especially from the implied admissions of "that most able and candid journal, the *Saturday Review*; a paper remarkable for its acuteness in detecting historical inaccuracies." Some Catholic will get up and object, that the calumny was denied at the time. "True," will be the reply;

"but not by the Jesuits themselves." "The Jesuits," it will be rejoined, "never exculpate themselves." Upon which the orator will triumphantly observe, amid the cheers of his audience, "Of course not, and for a very good reason—because they can't."

But the *Saturday Review* has a particular spite against the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. We almost shrink from polluting our pages with its language on the subject; but that language may furnish a warning to those who are deceived by the occasional fairness of this periodical when speaking of Catholics, into regarding it as an auxiliary to our cause.

The doctrine of the immaculate Conception . . . has its moral, or as most people think, its *immoral* side. It is the most powerful doctrine which has ever been invented (*sic*) for working on the physico-religious emotions of women. An *hysterical* doctrine will never be without its crowd of female devotees. The month of Mary is but the revival of the *mystical orgies of Cybele*.

After proceeding to say that the catastrophe of Santiago is relieved from the character of a Divine judgment only because Almighty God, had He intended to punish "doctrinal sacrilege," might be "presumed" [*i. e.* in the opinion of the *Saturday Review*] "to have selected the doctors and cardinals of Rome" as the objects of His vengeance rather than the women of Santiago, the writer continues:—

Chili was exactly the place where this particular doctrine was likely to be welcomed with *frenzied orgies*. . . . The religion which the "Virgin's Post-office" represents is not one whit better than *African Fetishism*, and, in so far as it is encouraged by men of education, it is a *treason against society*.

Say we not truly that they who can thus parallel the devotion to our Immaculate Mother by the impure rites of a heathen goddess—describe festivals in her honour as "*frenzied orgies*"—and compare confidence in the power of her intercession with the superstitions of idolatrous devoteeism—are the lineal descendants of those who attributed the works of the Divine Son of Mary to the agency of Beelzebub? It is the modern edition of the warfare carried on by the Serpent and his seed against the Woman and her Seed.

There is nothing which, in a small way, we desire more to see than the *Saturday Review's* profession of faith. We have sometimes in fancy sought to extract from the *obiter dicta* of that clever periodical its positive belief on religious matters, but we have always been baulked in the attempt. For instance, we are particularly anxious to know how the *Saturday Review* adjusts its views of Original Sin with those of the Immaculate Conception? We want to know, in short, not

whether the *Saturday Review* believes that the Blessed Virgin was exempt from original sin (for this question it has answered in the negative); but whether it believes that every other descendant of Adam is infected by it; and, if so, in what exact sense it receives that proposition. We confess we have never found in its pages any such distinct recognition of a pervading human corruption (excepting, indeed, among the Catholics of South America) as justifies this vehement opposition to a dogma which excludes the Mother of God from the operation of the general curse. It is certainly a little hard upon her, whom the *Saturday Review* must be charitably supposed to regard as the appointed medium of conveying to our Lord the human nature which He took into union with His Godhead, to show more eagerness in attributing innate alienation from God to her, than to all other persons born into the world since the Fall of Man. We do not say that the *Saturday Review* positively does this; nevertheless, as it has explicitly declared that the Blessed Virgin was *not* conceived without sin, we look for some very strenuous assertion of the doctrine that Adam's descendants in general are born under that disadvantage, as a very obvious *desideratum* in its theological system. If the *Saturday Review* should reply that its line is not dogmatism, but politics, economics, ethics, and the like, then we have only to say that it had better keep to that line, and not stray into a province in which it is certainly anything but at home. Yet, until it is in a condition to deal with theological questions in their theological bearing, it is certainly in no condition to take the tone of a preacher in relation to such subjects, and address its readers in a strain like the following:—

A more serious warning remains. The tone of the local comments on the Santiago tragedy is significant to others than the clergy of the Jesuit church of Santiago (*sic*), who, dead to all human sympathies except the unmanly instinct of self-preservation, yet live to ponder over—we can scarcely hope to repent of—the results of their teaching, and the first-fruits of their (*sic*) new dogma. If religion attempts to gain an indirect and sinister influence by ministering or pandering to the follies, the weakness, the ignorance, or the passions, of any part of the social body; if it draws, or attempts to draw, the line between man's reason and woman's sentiment, stimulating the one and affecting to despise the other; if it tampers with the family relations, if it calls up the fanaticism, or plays with the abject terrors of religious fear, it may be popular, but its popularity will end in showers of living fire. And, as in this case, it will be visited with the execrations, as well as the contempt, not merely of the political enemies of a powerful religious party, but of all those who think that religion, and its services and its ministers, owe some allegiance to common honesty and common decency.

We feel tempted to apply to this solemn trash the somewhat

impolite monosyllable with which Mr. Birchall, in the "Vicar of Wakefield," commented upon the sentimental rhapsodies of Lady Carolina Wilhelmina Amelia Skeggs.

We intended also to illustrate our remarks by some extracts from the *Spectator* of the same date, harmonious in spirit, but, if possible, even more offensive in language than the above. Some of these, indeed, we have incidentally quoted; but our space is at an end, and we will only therefore observe that the *Spectator* describes the priests of Santiago in particular, and Catholic priests in general, as, in effect, brutes in human form—"men who have cut themselves off from humanity"*—attributing to the rule of celibacy the origin of that contemptuous indifference to the feelings of the other sex which it considers to be characteristic of their order. We leave the *Spectator* to argue this question with those of its coadjutors who attribute to the same rule a precisely opposite class of evils. We grieve to add that the tone of the *Church Times*, from which journal we could have hoped better things, is scarcely one whit more religious than that of organs with which we should have thought it would have been ashamed to identify itself. That newspaper thus sums up its article on the Santiago calamity:—

There can be no two opinions as to the share of blame which must be awarded to the Roman clergy of Santiago. *There must be something rootedly wrong in the system which turns out such priests as these.*

We trust that hints of this kind will not be lost upon those Catholics who have been tempted to think favourably of the party, as a party, which the *Church Times* represents.

The single exception, as far as we know, to the abominable tone in which this sad catastrophe has been dealt with by the London press, and a most gratifying and honourable exception it is, is to be found in the *John Bull* of February the 6th, in an article happily entitled "Improving the Santiago Tragedy." At a time when as yet not even any Catholic had come forward to vindicate the priests and people of Santiago against these atrocious calumnies, and the doctrines of the Church against these blasphemous interpretations, that newspaper,

* The sentence that follows will serve to show the sort of frenzied hatred with which a certain intellectual class in this country is animated towards the Catholic priesthood. "And then we wonder that when in Catholic countries the populace are, by some wonderful chance, excited against the priests, it is always blood for which they cry, as the only argument to which priests are amenable." This, the writer proceeds to say, is a blunder. "They are wrong." Priests, as experience has proved, will "go readily enough to death . . . the one punishment they feel" is "the pecuniary ruin of the order." That is to say, murder—wholesale murder—however justifiable, has been found ineffectual for our purpose: wholesale robbery is the thing.

with a courage and honesty of which we cannot sufficiently express our admiration, stood forward, single-handed, as the champion of a most unpopular cause, and produced an article which, with such exceptions only as in no way detract from the merit of its writer, would do honour to any Catholic in the world.

As to the catastrophe itself, which has opened the floodgates of Protestant virulence and infidel profanity, we cannot but feel that there is everything in a religious point of view to comfort those whom it suddenly bereaved of all which was dearest to them on earth. Their darlings were taken out of this miserable world upon a day on which, in preference to most others, a good Catholic would wish to die. Their death, too, was not, as it might have been, in some place of worldly, though not sinful dissipation; nor was it even in their own homes, amid their ordinary, though not directly religious occupations. It was in a church, into which they had not rushed for asylum, but in which they were found by God gathered together, with the deliberate purpose of honouring Him in and through His Blessed Mother. Accounts tell us also, and with every probability, that most of them had been to Communion in the morning. They died also under the immediate effect of a sacerdotal absolution, and with words of authoritative comfort sounding in their ears. When we contrast with a calamity like this the wholesale slaughter of a battle—in which twice as many human beings, and often more, are hurried into God's presence "with all their imperfections on their heads," with the grievous sins of military life unrepented of, and with those sins increased by the addition of deliberate and deadly hatred, pride, ambition, and all the other evil passions of war—we cannot but augur most unfavourably of a state of society in which the one of these calamities is hailed with demonstrations of national joy and thankfulness, while the other evokes no sentiments in the mass of men but those of a merely human compassion for the sufferings of the victims, accompanied by the foulest slanders upon the system which was in no way the necessary cause of the catastrophe, but in every way that of the immense consolations by which, both to the sufferers and to their surviving friends, its horrors were subdued and its bitterness alleviated. We are as far from stigmatizing the one class of deaths with the brand of murder, as of claiming for the other the *aureola* of martyrdom. Yet we think that even such an exaggeration would be infinitely more reasonable than the philosophy which, while it would look with pride and satisfaction on the carnage of Waterloo, can turn away with unutterable disgust from the sacrifice of Santiago.

Essays and Miscellaneous Papers.

[The fourth and concluding part of Canon Oakeley's "Notes of the Tractarian Movement," which has been unavoidably postponed, will appear in the next number.]

SPIRITUALISM.

VERY many years ago, the present writer, then an Oxford student, was walking in the fields with a friend of his own age, when the conversation chanced to fall upon Antichrist—who he would be, and what he meant. My friend remarked, "Do you know, I believe that Antichrist is Mesmerism!" The idea at the time was so totally new to me, that I turned round in astonishment, thinking for the moment that a very clear head had been suddenly visited by insanity. In fact, the remark thus early made by a mere boy showed no common powers of thought, if he did not derive the suggestion from some mind of deeper and more matured powers. If Mesmerism, five-and-twenty years ago, appeared so startling a phenomenon to reflecting persons, what shall we now say of a whole system of real or pretended facts, and theories built upon them, in which Mesmerism would enter as no more than an ingredient—a manifestation of a comparatively unimportant and ancillary description? This system, or, if that is too ambitious a word for the present state of the question, this assemblage of marvellous events and views, is called, as all the world knows, Spiritualism. It groups together, not only Mesmerism, Animal Magnetism, and other wonders which astonished recent generations, but new ones peculiar to the last dozen years—spirit-rapping, table-turning, spirit-writing, and spirit-drawing. And it loves to bring these into connection with preternatural interventions more or less currently believed to have occurred in all ages:—second-sight, ghosts, fetches, significant dreams, the use of the crystal, and magic in general—all evidencing that presence of spiritual agency which constitutes the vague *credendu* of the new sect. Magic, no doubt, is disavowed by those on

whom I principally comment in this paper, and necromancy, too, is a vulgar and frightful word. But, without knowing it, they trench closely upon, or even touch, these forbidden things, and there are, in the present day, persons who pursue them. However, "Spiritualism," as the word is now used, seeks to include within its range the preternatural facts traceable in all religions, Christianity as well as heathenism and Mahomedanism. It treats the Catholic religion, properly so called, as only one out of many instruments by which man has communication with the invisible world, and it regards Mormonism as no less.

Here is something which most certainly, if not Antichrist, is at least highly antichristian, and, by the very audacity of its pretensions, cannot be ignored, nor answered merely by pooh-poohing it. Contempt, in one sense, undoubtedly it merits, because all the efforts of evil, we know, can only end in defeat. But not contempt, if that be the expression for the supposition that we have only a transient and familiar adversary to deal with. Sects arise now and then of merely local importance. A fanatic gathers some followers about him, but his influence does not penetrate beyond a single country or a particular class. Spiritualism, starting from trifling occasions, and in an obscure corner of the world, has spread over the two great continents which are the seats of the highest development of the human race. In the United States it reckons its adherents by hundreds of thousands. In Europe it has been flattered by emperors, and its chosen haunts seem to be the saloons of the most distinguished circles in the two leading capitals. It has been thought a passing fancy of idle brains; but ten years have revolved since it began to command attention, and it is with us still. Like the trees which the Roman poet* imagined appearing on a sudden, if his own wild theory of atoms were not the true one, we behold a vast mental vegetation, of no very desirable aspect, which has gathered in our sight, we hardly know how; and unquestionably it will, sooner or later, have to be dealt with by a power which has coped in its day with kindred forms of evil, not less extensive or less appalling.

I propose in the present paper to place before the reader a selection from the immense mass of recent facts, out of which, in connection with kindred phenomena of all times, has been woven together the system called Spiritualism. I will endeavour to describe that system in its present stage, and will then inquire what view it seems most congruous with our

* Lucretius, i. 187.

faith as Catholics to take, both of the system and its facts. Let me remark, by way of introduction, that this great outburst of curiosity concerning supernatural manifestations, this craving for them, and readiness to accept them, was to have been expected. At all times there are whole classes of men who succeed in completely excluding the supernatural from their minds, and to whose vision it never reflects itself at all from the field of human action. And in certain periods this school predominates in human thought. For example, such a class is represented in Greek literature by the historian Thucydides, who throughout represents the world simply in its natural aspect, and with whom cause and effect are, alike and always, limited to the earth. He lets us know that the time was one of great excitement and mysterious anticipations; but he merely states this as a fact, and has himself no eye or ear for the marvellous, of which, doubtless, we should have heard enough, had Herodotus written the history of the Peloponnesian war. In modern times literature generally, from about the period of Locke to that of the Scottish school of philosophy (to refer to British writers as examples), was characterized by this utter dismissal of the supernatural. The world seemed a machine wound up once for all by its Author, and requiring no further application of that power which seemed to have spent itself, so to speak, in the act of creation. Or, at any rate, its interference was limited to a remote period, carefully barred off from the present régime. Miraculous events there might have been in Judæa, at an epoch in which totally different laws reigned, as we may imagine mysterious things to take place at the limits which separate our sidereal universe from another, or from empty space. But with all that we had nothing to do, and might say, with a class very much resembling these thinkers: "Since the time that the fathers slept, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation."—2 Peter, iii. 4.

This way of viewing things is, however, too much at variance with the instincts of mankind to be permanent. Its teaching is in defiance of the most imperious assertions of the conscience and the most earnest longings of the heart. The great bulk of the world feel what the few can put into words, that an order of things so vast as that which we behold around us cannot have ascended to man to stop there; that there must be beings transcending him; and that a supernatural system exists, to account for this stupendous material creation. If these anticipations and convictions have been checked, they are sure, at some time or other, to re-assert their rights with a force not to be withstood. The "minute

philosophers" had left out of reckoning important truths, whole fields of the human mind; had, at the utmost, flattered the understanding, whilst the reason and the imagination were left to starve; so the resurrection of the latter could not but be startling in proportion to the length and violence of their repression. Nor is it to be wondered at, if the powers of evil seize a moment so favourable for the triumph of superstition and the thwarting of the purposes of Heaven. We know what results came forth after the materialism originated by Epicurus—that Hume of the ancient world—had prevailed for a couple of centuries, what wild forms of error swept across the Roman horizon, how the leaders of thought had no sooner relegated the supernatural into the *intermundia*, invented by their master, than the people caught at Mithraic and Sabazian mysteries,—at the worship of Osiris and Isis; and again, at the wide-spreading Gnostic and Manichæan delusions, with which the spirit of Antichrist sought to combat the Author of all good. We are living at this day in a very similar state of things; for whilst the parallel is complete between the materialism and the superstition of the two epochs, it also holds between the rise of the Catholic Church and the amazing energy with which, of late years, it has addressed itself all over the world, as if for the final struggle.

The manifestation of spiritual agency, or of a belief in it, in the heart of scepticism, had already, as is well known, presented itself in the early days of the French Revolution, when the pretensions of Mesmer and Cagliostro startled all Europe, and afforded many baffling objects of inquiry for the French Commission, conducted by Bailly and Franklin. Since then, the question of animal-magnetism, occupying a kind of debatable ground between the natural and the spiritual, had dragged on a sort of intermittent activity, if it was not wholly overlooked for a long time; till again about 1840 it became, for a few years, a fashionable subject of inquiry. Nothing, however, more unaccountable than the facts which had come before the revolutionary *savans* was alleged at its re-appearance. But about 1847, incidents of a description new to this generation were heard of in America, that hotbed for all strange growths of error. A detailed history of these events is not the object of this paper, but I proceed to state so much of them as is necessary to convey a distinct impression to those readers who have not had the opportunity, or have not thought it worth their while, to follow the accounts given at intervals in the literature of the day.

In December, 1847, a respectable farmer and his family, named Fox, settled in a house at Hydesville, a hamlet near

Newark, in the State of New York. They were troubled from the first with noises, which in January, 1848, assumed the definite character of knockings like that of a hammer. Two children, since so famous as the Misses Fox, felt something heavy, like a dog, lie on their feet when in bed, and one of them felt as if a cold hand were passed over her face. The knockings went on increasing in violence, and at length it was observed on some occasion when Farmer Fox tried the windows to see if they could be caused by the wind, that the knockings exactly answered the rattle accidentally made by moving the sash. This suggested the idea of inviting the noises, or rather the beings who caused them, to reply by rapping, on repetition of the letters of the alphabet, to questions put to them. This was first tried at a place called Rochester, with which the family were connected, whence the term "Rochester knockings" came into use. The experiment succeeded perfectly, and this was the origin of "spirit-rapping," which has since grown up into a regular system. The neighbours being called in, the affair soon thickened and developed into a "movement." The rappings revealed a murder which had taken place in the house when in other hands. Public meetings were called, committees of ladies formed to examine the children, and prevent the possibility of deception. Similar phenomena began to show themselves in various parts of the country, and under yet more extraordinary conditions. Raps were heard on all sorts of objects,—ceiling, tables, chairs, &c., and it was discovered that certain persons were better fitted than others to communicate with the spirits, to whom these noises were now attributed. Such persons were called *mediums*, a name with which the world is now sufficiently familiar, and when they were present tables and chairs would move about and rise from the ground. Many other astounding things became common; as drawing and music executed under this strange influence by persons who knew nothing of these arts. Exhibitions took place, in which figured two youthful performers, called "the Davenport Boys," who professed to be the mediums of a band of musical spirits, of whom the spirit of King, an Indian, was leader. The musical instruments were placed on a table; the youths were tied hand and foot, and the room darkened. Immediately the instruments began to fly about the room, playing over the hearers' heads! The boys on one occasion were fastened with iron handcuffs which were locked, and the keys placed aloft in a box. The spirits were desired to reach them, and unlock the handcuffs, which was instantly done. Those youths came from Buffalo. The Americans are a practical people, and the idea of a musical

entertainment in which ghosts performed for the amusement of the living, was taken up by a certain Mr. Koons, a farmer in the mountains of Ohio. He inhabited a log-hut in a remote part of the country, of difficult access; but for hundreds of miles round people flocked to the place, and the scenes must have been of a description wilder than anything known on this side of the Atlantic. This eccentric speculator had built a wooden cabin for the purpose, which was dignified with the name of "Koon's Rooms." On entering, you saw a table with a rack, on which were suspended various musical instruments,—fiddles, guitar, banjo, accordion, tambourine, French horn, &c. Koons and his son Nahum took their seats, and, on the shutters being closed, began playing on the fiddles. That instant all the other instruments struck up in tune with frightful energy. The tambourine went circling through the room, darting from place to place as it resounded. The house vibrated with the clang of drum, French horn, and accordion. Koons handed the spirits some phosphorus, with which the ghostly tambourine-player rubbed his hands, so that they were seen through the gloom whisking the instrument over the heads of the audience, and flashing like the lights thrown from a mirror. These performances, like those of the Davenport Boys, were stated to be conducted by the spirit of King, the Indian. In conclusion, the visitors shook hands with the spirits. All this is, no doubt, very strange and fantastical, but it appears that there are plenty of people who assert that they witnessed these phenomena, and have published accounts of them. Among these persons is mentioned Professor Mapes, a well-known agricultural chemist. Several other names are given by Mr. Howitt, not indeed known to us, but the thing was as public as any other representation, and the only question is how to account for the facts. Under the action of such excitement on the public mind, in eight years' time the adherents of the new sect, which rapidly formed itself, numbered in America no fewer than two millions and half, and in 1860 they turned the Presidential election.

The mania of spirit-rapping had been going on in the United States two or three years, when a youth became conspicuous in connection with it, who afterwards attained still greater celebrity as a medium in London and Paris. This was Daniel Dunglas Home, whose autobiography,* and the statements about whom in the *Cornhill Magazine* and elsewhere, have so completely puzzled those who resist the evidence of preternatural agency in the world. He has been sneered at as a mere juggler by a scientific person, who betrays, by the very

* *Incidents in My Life.* By D. D. HOME. London: Longman, 1863.

sneer, no little irritation at the embarrassing nature of the problem put before him. I, at least, who do not pretend to science, but can judge as well as the rest of mankind of the evidence afforded by character and manner, must admit that Mr. Home's autobiography, however the facts are to be explained, carries with it an impression the very reverse of deliberate imposition and trickery. The writer manifestly believes what he says, nor do I find any signs of an overheated imagination. Mr. Home probably will not be the better pleased with the conclusions at which I arrive, for these admissions, which it is as well to state at the outset. The book is so familiar to the public from numerous reviews, that in placing before the reader some of the leading particulars it contains, I may be fatiguing him. This, however, is essential, in order that we may form a connected view of the course of events which are still agitating so many minds, and which are far from having as yet reached the term of their development. In relating, however, both the following and any other extraordinary facts in this paper, I would by no means be understood to believe them all. I admit the existence of preternatural agency, but particular facts must rest on their own evidence, which, of course, ought to be severely sifted, for delusions of all sorts may readily enter in.

Mr. Daniel Home was born near Edinburgh, in 1833, and was taken to America by his relations when about nine years old. He was of a highly nervous temperament, and from an early age became the subject of mysterious visitations. When about the age of thirteen, he tells us of the apparition of a youthful companion whom he saw at the hour of his death, when hundreds of miles distant. This incident is very striking, with particulars different from those commonly met with. The moonlight had filled the room, when it was suddenly displaced in the apartment by darkness, though, beyond it, the moon was still shining; and through the darkness appeared a light, which increased, till he beheld in it the form of his friend, enveloped in brightness, and with wavy ringlets falling over his shoulders. The figure smiled, pointed upwards, and made three circles in the air with its right arm; after which the hand and arm, and then the whole body, melted away, and gradually disappeared, leaving the awe-stricken youth much like Æneas after the visit of the Penates in the moonbeams.

Nec sopor illud erat, sed coram agnoscere vultus,

Velatque comas, præsentiaque ora videbar :

Tum gelidus toto manabat corpore sudor.*—Virg. *Æn.* iii. 172.

* "Nor was that slumber; but I seemed in their very presence to recognize
VOL. II.—NO. IV. [*New Series.*] 2 G

After this, at the age of seventeen, he had a vision of his mother on the evening of the day she died, when he was audibly addressed by the apparition. It appears that the mother, and two of her uncles—all Scotch people—were believed to possess the second-sight. A few months after this event he was startled by hearing three loud blows at his bed's head, as if struck by a hammer; and next morning, more to the indignation than the fear of his aunt, with whom he resided, a shower of raps were heard all over the breakfast-table, as he was about to sit down. The enraged aunt, who unhesitatingly ascribed them to the devil, threw a chair at him. She had been already displeased at his taking to Methodism, whilst she was a rigid Presbyterian. However, the ministers of the former sect, together with a Baptist and a Congregationalist, were sent for in the afternoon to pray with him. Whilst the Baptist minister was praying with him, he says that gentle taps were heard whenever the holy names of God and Jesus were mentioned, and loud rappings at the expressions of supplications for God's mercy. This convinced him, poor boy, that the cause of the disturbances must be only good and true, else why should it have signified its joy at those particular passages? He resolved to place himself entirely at God's disposal, and to follow the leadings of this power—two resolutions very inconsistent with each other, though unhappily he imagined them to be one. The Congregationalist minister would not enter into the question, though he was against persecuting the youth; the Methodist attributed it to the devil, and treated him as a lost sheep. It is much to be regretted that at this early period of his life he did not meet with Catholic guidance, under which indeed he did come afterwards, but when it had to contend with the settled habit of these unlawful communications. At the time now referred to, he says he had only casually heard of "the Rochester knockings," and had paid no attention to the matter; so that he only comes in as a part, though destined to be an important part, of a widely-spread agitation of minds, arising from causes quite other than individual. He goes on to tell us that, in spite of the horror of his relatives, the rappings went on, and furniture began to move about without any visible cause. He states that he was consoled by a communication with the spirit of his mother, who predicted to him that his mission was a glorious one: to convince the infidel, cure the sick, and console the weeping.

Soon afterwards he quitted his aunt's house, and early in

their countenances and veiled locks, and their faces before my eyes. Then did cold sweat trickle all over my body."

the year 1851 became publicly known as a medium throughout New England. During the four following years, a great number of wonderful events took place, of which Mr. Home has given an ample account in his autobiography. I will bring together a few of them, though it is but anticipating much of what has since been witnessed in London and elsewhere. Tables moved of themselves, and so forcibly that two men were unable, with all their strength, to restrain the motion. In one instance, a table was moved about half a foot, with five men standing on it. A table rose clear of the floor and floated in the atmosphere for several seconds. A table tilted over at an angle of thirty degrees, and yet the objects on it did not roll off. A table was rocked like a vessel in a storm, by the spirits of certain drowned sailors, as was stated; and at the same time a violent creaking noise, as of cables, was heard—a prolonged wailing sound, as of a blast of wind through rigging, and the regular monotonous dash of waves. In the end, it was capsized on the floor, and all this without any one's touching the table. Violent rappings and concussions were heard in another case. Again a vibrating motion of the floor, like that caused by the distant firing of ordnance. Lights were produced in darkened rooms, sometimes tremulous and phosphorescent, sometimes like the gradual illumination caused by the dawn. Invisible hands touched people and grasped their hands, and an instance occurred, as since very frequently in England, in which a hand made itself sensible not only to the touch but to the sight. It took up a pencil and began to write, in a manner of writing which proved to be identical with that of a deceased lady. Mr. Home's hand was "taken possession of" and wrote the autograph of another deceased person. Finally, he was raised into the air and carried up to the ceiling. He had trances, in which he states that he was in communion with spirit-friends as palpably as with the living, and he gives revelations as thus obtained from the unseen world, in which he was told that death is but a second birth, corresponding in every respect to the natural birth.

In 1855, Mr. Home arrived in England, and a series of manifestations commenced, even more extraordinary, in some instances, than those which had been witnessed in America. They were so numerous, and so full of circumstance, that it would be impossible, with the space at my command, to give a sufficient number of narratives *in extenso*; and it seems the best way, in order to afford those readers (and there are, no doubt, even yet many) who have not turned their attention to the subject, an idea of the facts, if I again group together from the whole volume a few of the most striking of the alleged

phenomena. An instance is mentioned in which a table rose to the ceiling; another, in which a heavy loo-table rose eight inches and floated in the atmosphere with a sort of undulating motion, descending again without noise. Accordions played airs without any visible hand moving them. Sprigs of flowers were torn off and presented to people by the spirits. Handkerchiefs were knotted and thrown from under the table. Hands were seen and felt as palpably as mortal flesh and blood could be; sometimes an arm as well as a hand would appear, robed in white drapery. In short, a variety of events of this kind took place, the particulars being in some instances so grotesque that one is inclined to say that only the wildest credulity could believe in them. It is true that in very many of these cases we have only narratives unauthenticated by the names of the witnesses; but then for others, quite as impossible to all appearance, known witnesses come forward and declare they saw the occurrences with their own eyes. Dr. Gully, for example, the well-known physician of Malvern, has stated, under his own hand, that he witnessed Mr. Home floating about the room for many minutes, and guaranteeing the correctness of a full report of the circumstances which astounded the world in the *Cornhill Magazine*. And as to the tables rising in the air, the thing has become so common that it has been contended, by people at Paris, that it is simply natural. Attestations like these oblige us to regard those depending on Mr. Home's individual assertions, as bearing the same relation to the former which individual testimony to ordinary facts does to that which is corroborated by others. I shall therefore mention some of the incidents, in order to complete the view of the subject which I wish to place before the reader.

Mr. Home declares that he and his wife were visited one night by the spirit of Cagliostro, on which occasion the dark room became illuminated as if with the light of the sun. The spirit appeared to the pair in palpable material form, answered the question whether he was Cagliostro by three vivid flashes of light, spoke to them in an audible voice, and at parting left a delicious perfume! As to Mr. Home's infant son, he, according to his father's statement, stirred in his mother's womb, like another S. John Baptist, simultaneously with the rappings at *séances*; and we are informed, too, that soon after his birth, the warbling of a bird was heard over him, and a bright star appeared several times above his head. About Mrs. Home a great many characteristic and remarkable particulars are given by her husband. She was a Russian lady of rank, and died very young in 1860. She cordially entered into all her

husband's views about his mission, and appears to have made, with the most unsuspecting confidence, spiritualism a part of her religion. The extremely touching *style*, so to speak, of most of the incidents in which she appears, will probably prove a temptation to many minds, who are apt to forget that this pathetic beauty may easily veil some of the subtlest snares that Satan throws in our path.

Some time before her death, in bidding adieu to Mrs. S. C. Hall, the well-known authoress, she placed her hand in that of her friend's, and said, "Feel it—feel it well; for when I come to you, you must remember it." And at a *séance* which followed her death, Mrs. Hall states that a lace-cap was given her, under the table, by the spirit-hand of the deceased lady, and her fingers closed over it, she recognizing the pressure of the very hand she had known in life! On the same occasion the same witness avers that a celebrated sculptor, who had been working at a bust of Mrs. Home early on that morning, was thanked for it by a message of raps from her spirit, whose hand also he felt repeatedly on his. Mrs. Home is described as having been a member of the Russian Church; but if this, as would appear to be the case, means the schismatic Greek, she, at any rate, conformed, after her marriage, to the Catholic, as she received the last sacraments from the hands of the Bishop of Perigueux. Her religious views, as described in an obituary by one of her friends, afford very important evidence for judging of "spiritualism" as a religion, as well as of the temper of mind superinduced by contact with the Greek schism. A striking feature which pervades the former is the absence, so far as we have observed, of any consciousness of the character of sin as offending God, and requiring forgiveness. In fact, this is pride, inseparable, in one form or other, from all heresy. We are told that it would surprise "the Protestant Christian" not to find in poor Mrs. Home "the self-depreciation of the guilt-awakened sinner; not to hear on her lips the usual phraseology of the dying but suffering saint; no mention made of the atonement; of the works of grace on her soul; of the sufferings of the Saviour for her sake." Again, though she "loved the Saviour and rejoiced in Him," "Gethsemane and the bloody hill of the crucifixion were not present to her mind; the agony and the woe had no place in her experience. She was," adds her friend, "it must be remembered, the embodiment of her own Greek Church—of that Church in which she was educated, the most ancient faith of which has ever recognized the Saviour less as the crucified than as the Arisen,—the triumphant over suffering, sin, and death; as the Victor, and not the victim;

as the Lord, who said to his chosen ones, 'Rejoice that your names are written in heaven!'"*

Mr. Home was received into the Catholic Church in 1856. Early in that year his "power" had left him, a suspension which the spirits told him was to last for a twelvemonth. At the expiration of this term the rappings recommenced, and some extraordinary manifestations, which have been much talked of, are said to have taken place in presence of the French Emperor and Empress. Of course, Mr. Home's confessor, who was the celebrated Father de Ravignan, on being informed of these proceedings, strictly forbade him to have any further dealings of the kind. The conduct of the penitent upon this prohibition was very characteristic, and explains much in his career. He says, "I wished to *reason with him* [the italics are ours], and to explain that I could not prevent myself from hearing and seeing, for that, God having blessed me with the two faculties, it was not in my power to ignore them." When he went on in this strain, the Father told him he had no right to reason. "Do as I bid you, or bear the consequences." What did Mr. Home? He quitted his confessor "in great distress of mind," found some abbé of less strict views, who recommended him to another confessor, whom he attended for a few weeks previous to his temporarily going to America. Whether, on his return, he resumed his Christian duties, does not appear. He disclaims, with some warmth, a report that Father de Ravignan had said he would not see him again:—"On the contrary, it was I who said I would not go to him till he would reason with me." There is an amusing passage in Boswell's Johnson, *à propos* of a kindly-meant attempt of Langton's to hint to Johnson a prevailing fault in his character, which only put the great man in a huff. "What is your drift, sir?" he angrily asked; on which his biographer is very justly amused at the notion the scene suggested, of a penitent's getting up and belabouring his confessor. That of a penitent's *reasoning* with him is quite as ridiculous, if the subject were not so awful.

As it is not my purpose to draw up a memoir of Mr. Home, I leave him for the present, and proceed to notice the progress of the Spiritualist movement in London and Paris, from about the time of his coming before the European public to the present. It has been a movement, on the whole, rather belonging to the wealthy and refined classes, though its instruments—that is, the so-called "mediums"—are very often, perhaps most commonly, people of little education. The

* Home's *Incidents in my Life*, p. 215.

extent to which it is pursued in London comes out in a startling manner in a recent work, attributed to Mrs. de Morgan, the wife of the celebrated mathematician,* who has furnished a preface to it, and entitled, "From Matter to Spirit."†. It would appear that many ladies of distinguished rank and highly cultivated minds now spend a large part of their time in consulting what they believe to be the spirits of deceased friends; and that even the magic crystal, which a few years ago one thought confined to the domain either of fable or of the vulgarest superstition, is in full operation. There is quite enough in Mrs. de Morgan's book to furnish a solemn warning to those still capable of restraining a weak and forbidden curiosity; but whoever wishes to know to what appalling lengths the re-discovery of magic, as it is now announced to be, has gone in France, should consult the elaborate works‡ of MM. de Mirville and des Mousseaux. Mrs. de Morgan, however, has given the clearest and most intelligible account we have met with of the earlier phenomena, which, unhappily, she has studied but too carefully.

The manner in which the spirits are evoked (for we may fairly use the term) appears—in England at least—to be as follows:—Six or seven persons sit round a table, with their hands placed on it. In about twenty minutes, if the attempt is going to be successful, the table begins to throb and vibrate. In describing a similar phenomenon in a chair, a young person said there was a *heart* in her chair. The movement is a peculiar species of thrill; presently it begins to crack or creak, then to move in a circular direction, or "tip" on one side. On this one of the operators addresses the spirits, supposed now to be present, and arranges how many tips shall stand for "yes," "no," and so forth; or requests that by means of tips made on the repetition of the letters of the alphabet, a communication may be given by the unseen power. Instead of tips, sometimes raps are given. The raps are described as resembling slight discharges of electricity,—a sort of pecking, or clear, faint, ringing sound. Finally, sometimes the hand of one of the assistants will be taken

* My authority is the *London Review*, which mentions the fact as one generally known.

† *From Matter to Spirit*; the result of ten years' experience in spirit manifestations. By C. D. With a Preface by A. E. London: Longman. 1863.

‡ *Pneumatologie. Des Esprits et de leurs Manifestations diverses.* Par J. E. DE MIRVILLE. 4 tomes. Deuxième édition. Paris: H. Vrayet de Surcy. 1863.

La Magie du dix-neuvième Siècle; ses Agents, ses Vérités, ses Mensonges. Par le Chevalier GOUGENOT DES MOUSSEaux. Paris: H. Plon. 1861.

possession of by the spirits. It is first agitated violently, and, if the person takes a pencil, the hand is moved backwards and forwards, round and round, or in long curves and waves, till at last it settles itself, and writes legible words and sentences, or makes drawings; or one of the party becomes drowsy, and falls into a trance. These individuals are the *mediums*; that is, persons believed, from something in their bodily or mental constitution, to be peculiarly qualified for effecting a communication with the spiritual world. But the process I have described is superseded, in a great measure, in Paris, by the action of a medium alone. Indeed, the vulgar phenomena of tables rising, spinning, kicking, with which the public has been made familiar, are, in these select circles, of rarer occurrence, and are chiefly replaced by what may be considered as a higher order of phenomena. My authority, Des Mousseaux, describes them as bearing the same unmistakable stamp of an evil influence; but it is observable that the persons whose curiosity is habitually provoking communication with these frisky and eccentric intelligences, are very generally persuaded that they are in communication with pure or benevolent spirits. The medium, then—in the case given as an example by Des Mousseaux, a young, lively, ingenuous girl of sixteen—touches the table slightly with the end of her little finger, or very often does not touch it at all (the virtual intention being deemed sufficient by the invisible friends); a reply comes, in the shape of volleys of raps from the neighbouring pieces of furniture, or, more commonly, from the interior of the table at which the medium is seated. Movements of the table have been witnessed, which reminded the spectator of the illustrations to the fables of La Fontaine. M. des Mousseaux declares that he has seen the table, when not touched by any one, move up and rub itself caressingly against people, jump and bound like a joyous animal, angrily start forward, and fall back with violence. It is the signal of inspiration: the medium takes the pencil, while her eyes are raised with an expression of abstraction, and her hand appears to remain the mechanical instrument of the spirit. This might, of course, be feigned; but a method of verification has been hit upon. An individual, in a state of somnambulism, is placed in another apartment, who describes vocally all that is taking place. It is extremely rare for any discrepancy to exist between these independent reports of the phenomena in progress, but the spirits affect to be affronted at so mistrustful a proceeding.

Space would fail me were I to attempt to describe the various strange phenomena that disclose themselves. Mrs.

de Morgan mentions a medium who would lay one hand on a small table, and with the other play a waltz on a piano. The table jerked in perfect time to the music. She relates another case of a gentleman who, at one end of a room, placed his fingers on a little table, desiring audibly that it should move to the other end, making so many turns before reaching the end of its journey, which command the table punctually obeyed. Of course, it is to be expected that, in proceedings of this nature, as in so many others, familiarity will breed contempt. The classical reader will recollect how Lucian, or some other sarcastic observer of the ancient world, has commiserated Apollo for the very humble trials to which his spirit of vaticination was subjected, as faith in it grew low. The Fardarting King was summoned to answer questions which would have been in better keeping if addressed to a poor sixpenny juggler. A great deal of this levity is manifested in the *séances*. From an amusing volume by Mr. Spicer* I will condense a few illustrations of this. He states it as a fact, that a *séance*, in a house situated in a noisy London thoroughfare, commenced thus:—"Sperrits will be good enough to speak up, 'cos of the 'busses." At this same meeting a spirit was evoked whose replies gave general satisfaction, till, at last, a person present begged to ask what he (the spirit) subsisted on in his present state of being. "Same as I did on *hearth*," was the guarded reply. "And what was that?" urged the interrogator. "*Hair*." This answer appeared in singular keeping with what, in fact, was the case,—that the spirit, whilst in the flesh, had been a wig-maker; but it seemed odd how he could now live upon hair, and the question was put with all delicacy. However, it angered the spirit not a little, who gave a volley of indignant raps, demanded the alphabet, and spelt out "*Air*," no longer trusting the medium's pronunciation. However, as this seemed but meagre diet to some one who knew the deceased wigmaker's habits, in reply to a further query the following elegant answer was obtained:—"All folks lives upon *air*—leastways, can't *without* it." The same writer tells us, what, indeed, we might have expected, that there is a sort of conventional, technical tone among spiritualists, involving set phrases, hardly to be understood by the uninitiated. As a general rule, there are no greetings; the members of the circle come in unannounced. For instance, two young ladies arrive: the hostess merely glances in their direction. They

* *Strange Things among us*. By H. Spicer. London: Chapman & Hall. 1863.

look anxiously round, as if they were in a fog. "How do you find the atmosphere, dear?" says one to the other, in a half-confidential manner. "Purple-ish," is the reply, in a solemn whisper. "I find it rose." The hostess strikes in: "We have been very variable to-night, but the prevailing tints were certainly the yellow and blue." General talk follows. An accordion inside the fender had lately played "Polly, put the kettle on." Last week there had been hands—good hands, both gloved and bare, and one of them with a fine cinque-cento ring. But the best of all had appeared to a young lady at a recent *séance*:—

"Oh, Charlotte, Charlotte!" cries an animated young person, rushing from the inner drawing-room, "have you heard about Mildred's cockatoo?"—"Mildred's *what*?" "Cockatoo; but here she is herself." Enter Mildred, a tall, noble girl, with the style and aspect of a queen; with a slight curl on her beautiful lip, she tells the story of the cockatoo. At a *séance* held last week, in the boudoir of Mrs. Bow Peepe, Mildred was in such high favour with the invisible agencies that they invited her to hang her laced handkerchief over the edge of the table. Having done so, and presently withdrawn it again, lo! at one corner appeared the shaped and knotted similitude of a lovely cockatoo!

The writer goes on to say that this partiality of the spirits caused great envy among Mildred's friends, and many entreaties, vainly urged, to obtain a repetition of the marvel.

On the present occasion, immense efforts were made, in the hope that Mildred's presence might soften the obdurate agencies. The excitable young lady works herself into a perfect agony of supplication. "Oh spirits! *dear* spirits! *kind* spirits! give me a cockatoo like Mildred's. You see my handkerchief, spirits? Oh, do, do. A cockatoo-oo-oo!" &c. &c.

Another young lady brought six pocket-handkerchiefs, and arranged them at equal distances round the table; all in vain, however, as regarded obtaining a cockatoo. But one of them at length exhibited a double-knot. The writer assures us that this scene is a *fact*, and not caricature.

A circumstance which has given some uneasiness to the devotees of this singular religion is, that the communications, as will have been perceived in an instance quoted above, are often ill-spelt, or vulgarly expressed. "Beautiful" will be written "butiful;" "writing" "riting;" and so on. At one time the ingenious theory suggested itself that the spirit was writing phonetically; but what is now acquiesced in, appears to be that the communication is necessarily coloured in its form of expression by the medium through whom it passes. The spirits who make these revelations announce themselves

generally as the spirits of the dead, and deliver various messages of information about their present state to their surviving friends. But if one is to believe their word, the most miscellaneous epochs and societies are represented in these manifestations. According to Mrs. de Morgan, long strings of strange names have been spelt out by the tippings of the tables; as Richard Cœur de Lion, Pythagoras, Byron, Cheops, and Mr. Fontleroy. And these tantalizing spirits will play off all sorts of buffoonery on their simple victims for weeks, and then come in a body, giving all their names, with the information that they are come to say "*Good-bye for ever*," after which the extravagant names do not re-appear. But it does not always happen that the invisible agents declare themselves to be the spirits of the dead. Sometimes they are announced as the spirits of living persons at a distance. M. des Mousseaux relates at considerable length an example of this, in which a spirit habitually came to *séances* witnessed by him, who professed to be that of a living member of Paris society; much, I suppose, as Homer describes the *eidolon* of Hercules in Hades, while the real Hercules was quaffing nectar from the hands of Hebe in the celestial regions. And I observed a recent instance of a similar kind stated in the papers to have occurred at Glasgow.

And now as to the contents of the revelations thus furnished. Often they are nonsensical, and are liable also (which is a very significant fact, when one comes to consider the source from which they emanate) to be wicked and impure. Beginning with apparently harmless things, or which, at any rate, do not shock the moral feeling of the experimenter, they may end in the hand of an innocent girl being forced to write what can proceed from no good influence. Mrs. de Morgan, a very refined person, whilst admitting that, "a great deal of nonsense is written at first by mediums," says that, "excepting the proof that, if the unseen influence emanate from beings in another state, they are, if anything, in a lower mental and moral condition than ourselves, I know of nothing to be learnt by it." She goes on to say, that whilst the verses written by the unseen power were sometimes ridiculous, she has obtained verses not of a low and mischievous character (evidently implying that these latter do occur). "The best of these," she says, "contained beautiful ideas connected with the happiness of a life among the blessed and good in the world of good spirits and angels, very lovely descriptions of the scenery of that world or worlds, and much affectionate anticipation of reunion among friends, and future progress in happiness together" (p. 31).

The revelations quoted by this writer, and others of the same school, convey, on the whole, such views as these:—That the compound man consists of body, soul, and nerve-spirit; the last being, as it were, the body of the soul, the connecting link between the electricity in the atmosphere and the soul, which is accompanied by it in passing to the next world, though it parts with it, as some think, in ascending to a higher and purer state. That death is a perfectly natural process, and the life which succeeds it perfectly normal, without anything to surprise the percipient, any more than a child just born is surprised with what meets him here. That the process may be illustrated by the old example of the caterpillar inclosing the future butterfly.

The state after death is described as, in very many cases, one of inactivity, in consequence of the great difficulty of working into better life, which makes imperfect spirits become indolent from utter despair, although every spirit in heaven has occupations and amusements for its recreations. The wish to be better does not arise, in some, for years, and it is awakened by the companionship of others. Many spirits spend ages in the frivolous occupation of watching the entrance of other spirits into heaven. [The term "heaven" is explained, in other communications, as the spirit world.] The spirits appear to take a great and even busy interest, in many instances, about their families and connections on earth, and are often desirous of communicating with the visible world, in order to relieve the tedium of eternity. The more earthy the spirit is, the more easily does it manifest itself to those still in the body, both to the eye, and sometimes to the ear; and this is applied to explain the various stories about ghosts. In the system thus in course of formation, the notion of hell, as the word is commonly understood, does not occur. A spirit alleged to have communicated with a Mr. Brittan of New York, stated that "the burning gulf, with all its horrible imagery, existed only in the traditions of man, and in the fitful wanderings of his distracted brain."* [It is explained that during her life she had become insane from dwelling on this idea.] Again, hell is understood to mean rather the discomfort and misery attending a state for which the spirits are unfit; for example, those who have entered the spirit world unbidden; or the pangs which the spirit sustains in witnessing the errors and unhappiness of survivors, such as children, for which the spirit, whilst in the body, was to blame. Communications delivered by mediums

* Home's *Incidents in my Life*, p. 27.

are stated to be generally expressed in a typical form, in which certain material symbols, as bells, roses, houses, and so forth, correspond to ideas which the initiated can interpret, and in the study of which Mrs. de Morgan seems to have largely aided herself by the writings of Swedenborg. As an example of these correspondences, I may mention that the spirit of a suicide was described as clothed in rags, and inhabiting a dismal sort of cave. On the whole, the communications appear to be either frivolous, or such as are not at all beyond the powers of the ordinary imagination of persons who take an interest in such subjects, though I do not consider that this at all decides the question as to the preternatural character of their deliverance. A spirit stated that, after death, everything seemed at first to be in a whirl of excitement, and that he said to himself, "Death is not so bad a thing after all, and I should like to see what that country is to which I am going, if I am a spirit;" and that presently afterwards he met two of the inhabitants of his new sphere, "who were men of intelligence, but, like himself, had given no special attention to the higher principles of spirituality;" and that these spirits "shook hands with him in a sort hail-fellow-well-met way that was very pleasant to him"!* A favourite image in these revelations is that of a process in the next world illustrated by the passage of a river, which must be crossed in order to usher them into the complete possession of their new life. This is so closely allied to certain ideas of the North American Indians on the same subject, that one might almost imagine that the mediums had borrowed from them.†

The foregoing may suffice to give an idea of the sort of theology, so to speak, which the English and American spiritualists announce as obtained by them from the other world in this very singular manner. What I have described is, however, not the only mode they resort to in the indulgence of an unhallowed curiosity. I have already alluded to the use of "the crystal." Mrs. de Morgan describes it as a clear, spherical, or egg-shaped piece of glass or rock-crystal, which produces on the eye of the seer effects like those of mesmerism. Sometimes he becomes sleepy, sometimes tears flow. Then the sight grows cloudy, and at length the glass, originally clear, presents a perfect black opaque sphere, in which, after

* "A Narrative of the Experiences of Horace Abraham Ackley, M.D., late of Cleveland, Ohio, since his Entrance into Spirit Life." Quoted by Mrs. de Morgan (*From Matter to Spirit*, p. 150).

† See *Kitchi-gami: Wanderings round Lake Superior*. By J. G. Kohl. London: Chapman & Hall. 1860. P. 216.

a time, some light appears, and then a succession of scenes, in which the spirits of the dead are supposed to reveal themselves to their friends. The medium, in an instance mentioned, wrote, under the spiritual influence, "I could show myself to you, if you would look in the crystal." I myself recollect, many years since, and long before the rise of spiritualism, meeting a person who described his having seen one of these mirrors, to enable him to inspect which, the individual who showed it grasped both his hands, and placed his feet over those of the consulter. And the facts which came out at a recent trial in reference to the mirror of the notorious "Zadkiel," must be in every reader's recollection. I cannot sufficiently express the painful feeling caused by the manner in which Mrs. de Morgan relates the proceedings I have mentioned, both as to the above phenomenon and many others in her book. We have before us, to speak in plain terms, simple necromancy—short, in her case apparently, of actually evoking the dead—but still constantly implying a certain *compact* with the supposed spirits; nay, in the case of the crystal, we even perceive sorcery and magic. And yet with a sort of tranquil, refined complacency, she speaks as if she were engaged in something perfectly safe, innocent, and commendable.

In France the darker features of the system seem to have disclosed themselves to a much greater extent, and in the picture presented by the revelations contained in M. des Mousseaux's volume, the horrible and the grotesque seem mingled in nearly equal proportions. He describes, as having occurred at a *séance* he witnessed, vaporous flecks of light hovering about the persons present, and some of them moving one after another on the floor, in such a manner that one of the party exclaimed, they were "luminous rats," an expression which he says had some truth about it, as describing the phenomenon. Afterwards, he perceived the darkness thicken in a very remarkable manner in a particular part of the room; it became so dense that it produced on him the effect of a body that touched him,—a sort of dry, tangible mist, causing a sense of external discomfort and of internal trouble. Presently, in the midst of the darkness, two luminous points suddenly appeared, which he compares to cats' eyes illuminating a sort of vaporous head, formed by two spiral wreaths of vapour, which disengaged themselves, and wound round the two fixed points. He gazed steadily at them, approached, and attempted to hit one of the eyes; the object immediately changed place, and kept flying from his touch at the distance of less than an inch. M. des Mousseaux persisted, and pressed

and rubbed with his thumb the bright circle he saw against the wall of the stove. It emerged, however, as before, and continued to shine for a long time. Tired of these manifestations, one of the party invited the spirits to give him some of the sounds they produced in haunted houses. The instant the request was uttered, most extraordinary noises proceeded from the inside of a slender table, which remained quite motionless. They were continued, prolonged, and very various, rubbing, sawing, scraping, scratching, rolling, and lasted about two minutes. Direct evocations of departed spirits have been made, and the same writer quotes long examinations to which the spirits of Robespierre and Judas Iscariot, of all people, have been subjected. The former answered sometimes by the alphabet of knocks, sometimes by the pencil of a medium. As a scene it must have been startling, but I hardly think the report of the examination, which revealed despair, but which was otherwise barren of any statement of importance, worth transcribing. On Robespierre being asked whether he had wished for power merely for the love of power, at first there was no reply; but presently came three terrible knocks at intervals, ringing almost like metal, and which seemed to come from the thickness of the neighbouring wall. This noise the spirit declared to have been made, not by himself, but by a *valbin* (a class of demons so called by the mediums). At the end of the *séance*, the table rose, shook, and was violently knocked about (*secouée violemment*) several times, without any one's touching it. The interrogation of Judas Iscariot was conducted by a celebrated oriental traveller, M. de Saulcy. It is very long, and full of detail. There are passages in it which seem to suggest the idea that the knockings or writings, however we are to explain them, answer to the thought of the operator, and, as it were, reflect himself. An example or two will explain what I mean:—

What is the name of the suburb opposite Hacedama?—Oph. Is that Ophel?—Yes. Write me the name of the king who caused the great bridge to be built!—Sa Is that Salomon?—Yes. Who caused it to be cut?—Po Is that Pompey?—Yes. Is the balcony also Salomon's?—No. Whose is it?—Ez Is that Ezechias?—Yes.

M. des Mousseaux notices, like Mrs. de Morgan, that the spelling of the spirits is often defiant of the rules of grammar. For example, in reply to the question, "*Quels ouvrages avais-tu lus contre la religion?*" Robespierre says, "*De trop mauvais, j'aurai dû les aneantirs.*" Again, "*Je me repantirai!*" *J'ai versé trop de sang!*"

As for spirit-writing, that is, writing produced by invisible

agency, without any human hand touching the paper, if we are to believe Baron Guldenstubbe, from whose work, *Pneumalogie Positive*, M. des Mousseaux gives extracts, hundreds of specimens have been obtained, and various ocular witnesses of distinguished names are cited. Even writings in French and Latin are mentioned, containing maxims of moral philosophy, chiefly referring to man's future life, and signed by such names as Plato, Cicero, Virgil, Julius Cæsar, Octavian Augustus (*sic*), Juvenal, S. John, and S. Paul.

I believe it quite possible that wicked spirits play off tricks on their victims, but I must, with M. des Mousseaux, be excused believing that Baron Guldenstubbe has elicited fragments of original composition from any of the spirits he so courageously quotes. In fact, the unfortunate persons whose heads have been turned by their commerce with the invisible world, are not aware what absurdities they are made to accept. But this does not diminish the very extraordinary nature of these manifestations. We are told that "the first time he (Baron de Guldenstubbe) experimented, he placed white paper and a cut pencil in a box locked up, the key of which he always carried about with him, and told no one of his experiment. He waited twelve days in vain; but what was his astonishment, when, on August 13th, 1856, he observed certain "mysterious characters traced upon the paper"; and he successfully repeated the experiment ten times the same day! On the following day he made experiments with the box open, keeping his eyes upon it, and he actually saw characters and words in the Esthonian language form themselves on the paper, without the pencil moving. After that, he merely placed white paper on a table, or on the pedestal of ancient statues, or on tombs, at the Louvre, S. Denis, and elsewhere. He declares that S. Geneviève traced the initials of her name on her tomb, which is as true as that the other writings I have alluded to were autographs of Plato, Julius Cæsar, and the other great men from whom it was pretended they came.

After all this, it seemed only to need a step to revive the old magic and necromancy of a long-forgotten age. M. des Mousseaux describes a series of experiments, exhibited by a M. Regazzoni at Paris in 1856, and a conversation he afterwards had with the operator, which throws a good deal of light on what may too possibly be the real character of the mesmeric marvels of itinerant lecturers, attended for mere amusement by such unsuspecting crowds. The results produced were not much more surprising than those which are constantly advertised in the newspapers. The operator, by a silent

exercise of his power, caused a young girl, whose eyes and ears had been carefully bandaged, suddenly to drop down, as though struck by a hammer, and as rigid as marble. Other subjects, whilst under his influence, were rendered absolutely insensible to the sudden application of heated iron; their eyes were motionless under the brightest light, brought so close that it seemed as if it must burn their eyelashes, and their ears were deaf to the sharpest sounds. Others, again, went through any sort of fantastic movements which the spectators suggested to the operator to will; and there was one poor creature, under this powerful fascination, whose breasts became swollen to the most frightful size, so that it seemed as if she must become suffocated, or suffer agonizing torture. Nothing of the sort, however, ensued; she appeared perfectly calm, and the inflation subsided in a few seconds, under the action of some contrary machinations on the part of the exhibitor. So far, many would account for all this by mesmeric operations (only an expression for our ignorance); and, in fact, one of the spectators, a physician who accompanied M. des Mousseaux, was able also to produce the effect just described by an act of his will. But M. Regazzoni, in conversing on the phenomena with M. des Mousseaux, whilst endeavouring to account for them by the agency of a fluid, sometimes intelligent, admitted that "*in all his difficult operations* there was a little invocation . . . but addressed to benignant spirits." Those who wish to examine an instance in which the avowed use of sorcery was attended, not very many years ago, with results of the most astounding kind, witnessed by many persons at once, may consult the ample narrative given by M. de Mirville, of the occurrences at Cideville (Seine-Inférieure) in 1850. I think it unnecessary here to reproduce the account, as it has already been fully given by Dr. Brownson in a well-known work. Suffice it to say that there figure in it such incidents as a preternatural whirlwind, heavy objects flung about the room without visible agency, chairs suspended in the air, wounds inflicted on the unseen sorcerer, and afterwards observed on him, when he actually presented himself. The public journals did all they could to ignore the facts; but that they are testified by credible witnesses, it would appear obstinately to deny.

The existence of magic in Europe in this 19th century takes us by surprise, though in the East most readers are aware that it is professed at the present day, as it has always been. By way of illustration of this, I may relate some particulars furnished by a recent Anglo-Indian traveller, which may be new to many who are familiar with the ordinary tales of the

Hindoo jugglers. The writer, a lady, met with an English officer who had become an adept in the arts of the Bheel wizards, by instructions received from them. This power consisted in a kind of authority over living but inanimate objects, such as plants and trees, which it was declared could be made—by invoking the spirits of earth, air, and water, according to a certain formula, especially an adjuration of the most sacred name (probably the mystical name of the Hindoo Triad, OM or AUM)—to bend and advance towards the person using the incantation. The officer admitted that his conscience had been at first uneasy, but said, "One becomes accustomed to anything." His performances, which the lady declined to see, had been witnessed by a Madras civilian, who confirmed them. The same writer was assured by another English officer, that an individual of the Contingent having lost some property, sent for a Bheel conjurer, who, after several mystic rites, caused a brass lotah (water-vessel) to move of itself towards the thief, and afterwards to the place where the property was hidden. To test the imputed powers of the conjurer, this officer himself secreted a ring, and in order to find it, was told to place his hand lightly on a brass saucer. He had no sooner done this, than he felt the saucer start beneath his hand, and it soon brought him to the person to whom the ring had been consigned. The circumstances were such as to preclude all possibility of collusion. The Mahometans in India believe all this to be the effect of magical secrets handed down in certain families from a remote antiquity.*

To return, however, to the extraordinary manifestations which have occurred nearer home. The evidence which has been alleged regarding them can only be ignored by those who set out with the principle of believing nothing for which they cannot account. The incidents have very naturally startled a multitude of minds, and a disposition, best exemplified in Mr. Howitt's "*History of the Supernatural*,"† seems to have arisen, greedily to accept everything of this nature which presents itself, with little examination, and an astonishing indifference to the consideration that, even if they be admitted, the next question is, from what source they come, and whether they form a lawful branch of human knowledge and practice. Mr. Howitt, with a wonderful amount of

* "*Our Last Years in India*," by Mrs. John B. Speid. London: Smith, Elder, & Co. 1862. Pp. 107-111.

† *History of the Supernatural, in all Ages and Nations.* By WILLIAM HOWITT. 2 vols. London: Longman. 1863.

reading, and a sort of sanguine, impulsive style, showing, however, as little of the spirit of historical criticism as he does of orthodoxy, has run through the whole series of records accessible to a student of his class, and has, no doubt, proved what it is strange could ever have been matter of question, that the so-called spiritualism is no new thing, but that it has prevailed in all ages and nations, and that even in the period of the last century, which one generally imagines the coldest, most prosaic, and, withal, the most sceptical, ample evidences of it are to be found. The miracles of Catholic saints themselves figure in his imagination, in a sort of wild dance, with the extravagant scenes at the tomb of the Abbé Paris, and the whimsical portents of the spirit-rappers. S. Teresa, S. Catherine, and the whole array of the mystical saints, are welcomed into the uncongenial company of Luther, Whitfield, Swedenborg, and the Seeress of Prevorst; and the Paganism of the ancient world, and of India and China at the present day, contribute their various supplies to his eager appetite for supernatural interference. As an example of a prevailing tendency, originating deep in human nature, which Anglicanism, as Mr. Howitt sees and abundantly shows, has stifled, but which the Catholic Church has controlled and regulated, as he does *not* see—withstanding the most striking and important admissions he makes in its favour—his book is one of the most remarkable I have met with in this inquiry. I do not purpose to go into an analysis of the evidence on which the facts which have been submitted to the reader depend, because it is sufficient, for a *general* conclusion, if it be admitted that many of these are too public and too notorious to be denied. That the preternatural may enter into them in very different degrees I most fully admit, and I should insist, in any particular instance, that the most rigid caution should be exercised before pronouncing that such and such phenomena were preternatural. But if we admit the preternatural at all, which as Catholics we do, I confess I do not see why we should hesitate to apply it, in *general*, to effects which seem to cry out, if any can do, for its supposition. In such cases, the *onus* immediately lies on those who refuse to allow that it has, or can have, anything to do with these phenomena. Here is an adequate cause. Here are effects resembling what have in all ages been assigned to this cause (for Howitt's book is quite enough to show that no age has been without these extraordinary phenomena), why then hesitate to account for them by it? To ask, therefore, why need we suppose the preternatural has to do with them, is only referring us to the yet more remote question,—why believe in the preternatural? So far as

Reasoning from
offices & cause.

it bears on the present inquiry, I would say, I believe in the preternatural; first, and *naturally*, by an impulse which is evidently felt by the great bulk of mankind, and always has been. The sceptics, once more, are not likely to urge anything more persuasive than this. Οὐ πάνυ πιστότερα ἐπεὶ, as Aristotle says. Secondly, this impulse has led me to accept as probable what it led the eyewitnesses to accept as self-evident, various effects recorded in the Sacred Scriptures, and other venerable records, which transcend the ordinary laws of nature. But having thus been led up to the region of faith, the faith itself has become to me a far more cogent argument for the reality of these phenomena than the phenomena themselves. I can safely say that the belief I have in the Divinity of our Lord is higher than the belief I could have had, not yet a Christian, in my own vision of His miracles. For my eyesight might deceive me. The very essence of faith is, that it cannot deceive, as resting on the testimony of Him who cannot lie. This is evidence which the sceptic cannot be expected to appreciate, and which it is hardly to be expected he can do other than treat as prejudice. But to him I should say, not by way of a complete explanation, which he can only acquire by acquiring faith, that its entire correspondence with all the needs of my spiritual nature provides me with an argument for it, necessarily limited to myself, but still surer, as it is more impossible for me to resist than it would be to resist the witness of my senses. This faith, being itself supernatural, has given me the fact of the supernatural, and of the preternatural generally; and has, moreover, led me to recognize an authority especially empowered to pronounce upon, and deal with, the very questions now before us. And this, in fact, has been done in many instances, in such a manner that the mind of the Catholic Church is sufficiently known on the subject. Take, for example, the encyclic letter addressed by the Holy Roman Inquisition to all bishops, under date July 30, 1856, against the abuses of magnetism. In that instrument, after quoting a former answer, the Sacred Congregation pronounces as follows:—

Although by this general decree the lawfulness or unlawfulness in the use or abuse of *magnetism* is sufficiently explained, yet the malice of men has so increased that, neglecting the lawful pursuit of science, and rather pursuing curious matters, to the great loss of souls, and damage of civil society itself, they boast that they have obtained a principle of soothsaying or divination. Hence these women, carried away by gesticulations not always of a modest kind, by the tricks of somnambulism, and what they call clairvoyance, babble of their seeing whatever is invisible, and presume to institute discourses con-

cerning religion itself, to evoke the souls of the dead, to receive answers, to reveal things unknown and distant, and rashly to practise other superstitious things of the same nature, sure of gaining, by divination, great profit for themselves and their masters. In all these things, whatever art or illusion it be that they use, where physical means are ordered to non-natural effects, there is found a deception wholly unlawful and heretical, and a scandal against virtuous morals. Therefore, efficaciously to restrain so great a crime, so hostile to religion and civil society, the pastoral solicitude, vigilance, and zeal of all the bishops ought as much as possible to be excited. Wherefore let the ordinaries of places, as much as they can, with the assistance of Divine grace, whether by the admonition of paternal charity or by severe reproof, or, finally, by the application of legal remedies, according as they shall judge it expedient in the Lord, regard being had to the circumstances of places, persons, and time, bestow all diligence to repress the abuses of magnetism of this kind, and to root them up, that the Lord's flock may be defended from the enemy, and the deposit of the faith be kept entire, and the faithful intrusted to them be preserved from corruption of morals.

Animal magnetism, or mesmerism, though commonly assumed to be a purely natural process, is intimately mixed up with the phenomena of spiritualism so far as regards the writing and other actions effected through the mediums. In answer to the question, "How do spirits write through mediums?" Mrs. de Morgan received the answer, "The spirit mesmerizes the medium." This was explained to be done "by the spiritual fluid which comes from the brain to the hand," and illustrated by a very original sketch, in which a good and evil spirit were represented as respectively throwing influence on the higher portion and on the base of the brain, following the usual division of the phrenologists. It would be rash to say that there are no mesmeric effects of a purely natural kind; but the phenomena of clairvoyance are as clearly preternatural as very much that we meet with in the lives of the saints, whilst the fact that the *will* of the patient is sometimes, if not ordinarily, required to be submitted, at least in the commencement, in order to success, at once makes the process of an unlawful kind. As for consultations by clairvoyance, they cannot be distinguished on any sound principle from the similar superstitious usages referred to the pagan oracles, many of which exhibited phenomena highly resembling what are so rife at the present day. The declaration of the Sacred Congregation shows the caution which always marks whatever comes from Rome. It is not denied there may be a use of magnetism, as there is an abuse; but, in reply to a postulate of the bishop of Lausanne and Geneva, in 1841, in which, after describing the usual phenomena of clairvoyance, he asked whether animal magnetism might

be practised as an art auxiliary to medicine, whether people might consent to be placed in the state of somnambulism, or consult persons in that state, always supposing a renunciation of any diabolical compact—the Sacred Penitentiary declared, that the use of magnetism, as set forth in the case, is not lawful (“Usum magnetismi, prout in casu exponitur, non licere”).

I derive the above particulars from a valuable article in F. Gury's *Compendium Theologiæ Moralis*, tom. i. App. II. The same writer quotes long extracts from a pastoral letter of the Archbishop of Quebec, in 1854, as an example of the censures which have been passed by various bishops against table-turning and spirit-rapping. In this the Archbishop forbids, as a superstitious practice, the causing tables to turn or rap, with the intention of invoking the dead or spirits, of consulting them, or having any communication with them. Perhaps the reader may be interested by my placing before him an extract from F. Gury's own argument on the subject, which will give an idea of the view generally taken of it by the soundest Catholic theologians. I translate from him as follows :—

In fact, whatever may be the case as regards the simple movement of the tables, which, perhaps, rigorously speaking, may be physical, if only it does not take place by a command of the will, the other effects, so stupendous, can only be attributed to an intelligent cause, but by no means to the powers of nature. For do the persons themselves propose the questions to a wooden or marble table, or expect answers from it? Not at all. There is no one so mad; for a general persuasion has prevailed that the case concerns spirits, by whom the tables themselves are moved, and who are, therefore, called *rapping spirits*. Now, these spirits cannot be good spirits; it would assuredly be blasphemous to assert that the angels or saints, enjoying eternal felicity, interfere in the puerile amusements of men, comply with their vain wish, and gratify their silly curiosity. It would also be utterly impious to say that God, who *hates divination*, and [has therefore strictly forbidden it, allows the inhabitants of heaven to be subservient to it. Spirits of this sort must, therefore, be called evil spirits, accursed of God for ever, who are continually laying snares for men. But is it not horrible to have such a commerce with evil spirits? To invoke them with earnest entreaty? And in this way to render them real worship? Is not this the crime of divination, which has been forbidden by God as a great abomination?—*Ibid.* App. i.

He goes on to say :—

It is not lawful to interrogate tables, or other objects of the kind, for the sake of experiment or amusement. For it is not lawful to make an experiment on a thing evidently evil, or to amuse oneself with it. For to this refers that noble saying of S. Peter Chrysologus : *Qui joculari voluerit cum diabolo, non poterit gaudere cum Christo*. [He that chooseth to sport with the devil, will not be able to rejoice with Christ.]

There is no condition which is held by the spiritualists as

more important than that the *wills* of those who assist at *séances* should harmonize and combine for the purpose. As to invocation, the whole process may be called so, and I have already quoted a miserable specimen of eager, however frivolous and absurd, entreaties addressed to the spirits believed by the person who so spoke to be present. Of the judgment and mind of the Church, then, on this subject, there can be no doubt. But it will be an interesting part of our inquiry, with which I shall conclude the present paper, to consider some of the grounds which have probably led Catholic theologians to these conclusions.

The Catholic Church has reduced spiritualism, in the true sense of that word, into a regular science. She has been observing now for nearly two millenniums, the relations that are permitted to exist between the spiritual world and that of nature; it is no wonder, then, that no institution is in possession of such an accumulation of facts on the subject, as any one may see who turns over the pages of the *Acta Sanctorum*. There is no phenomenon which excites the curiosity of the present day, which does not find a parallel in her experience, from the ascents of Simon Magus to those of Mr. Home. And her great writers have furnished a complete system of rules by which to determine the judgment we are to pass upon such manifestations and claims. I will mention one great work which is a perfect storehouse of principles of this kind, Cardinal Bona's treatise *De Discretionem Spirituum*. In examining that work, I have been surprised to find how completely he meets, by anticipation, the sort of false miracles and revelations now current, and enables us, without hesitation, to refer them to a diabolical author. The great majority of his tests have a fatal application to the pretensions which are so confidently urged; and I may say the same of those in the great treatise of Benedict XIV. on Canonization (I refer to the third volume of that portion translated by the Oratorians, under the title of "Benedict XIV. on Heroic Virtue"). I will instance a few of these rules. Gerson, as quoted by Benedict XIV., says—"This is the principal and chief test among the tests of our spiritual coin. All interior warnings, all strong impressions, all revelations, all miracles, all ecstatic love, all contemplations, all rapture, and lastly, all interior and exterior workings, if preceded, attended, and followed by *humility*, if mixed up with nothing destructive of it, have with them a sign that they come from God or a good angel; nor can you be deceived." And to the same effect writes Cardinal Bona. "This fear (attendant on divine ecstasy) breeds the deepest humility, as well because of the danger of a heavier fall from the loftiest elevation, as because the soul, elevated to light in-

accessible, sees therein the least defects; and, clearly knowing how far she is from purity and perfection, which is necessary for her to be worthy of such great gifts of God, is filled with fear and confusions."—(*De Discretione Spirituum*, c. xiv.) Now certainly this humility is not seen in the conduct of Mr. Home, when he acted in flat disobedience to his confessor, Father de Ravignan, and sought out for himself a more complying guide. And if ever we read a book characterized by tranquil intellectual pride, it is the often-quoted treatise "From Matter to Spirit." The frivolity, too, of the commerce with spirits, the disgusting familiarity of it, in many instances, is another note of pride. *Docility* is another test, coming, in fact, under the same principle. "The instinct which comes from God makes the soul docile," says Cardinal Bona, "acquiescing in the opinion and counsels of others, especially elders and superiors;" and this is plainly wanting. *Fear* is another test, presenting itself at first, but followed by a great freedom from anxiety, internal sweetnesses, increasing charity and humility, and exciting a desire of the highest perfection. Is there anything answering to all this in the general character of *séances* and the mediums who act in them? *Inconsistency* in revelations delivered to two different persons makes both to be suspected. Revelations are to be held as false or suspected, when the things revealed *do not tend to the glory of God* or the salvation of men; when any one is surrounded with light in the presence of others, unless he is truly humble, and of long-proved holiness. Again, if that which is revealed is not beyond human intelligence; because then the revelation is *superfluous*. The very frequency of revelations makes them suspected. In the case of ecstasies, it must be observed whether the soul is capable of such a grace, to what degree of divine love it has ascended, whether it lives a life above the world, and elevated to God by *self-denial of all sorts*; for the raptures of him whose life does not agree with gifts of this nature, are exposed to the greatest dangers, and are not to be held as true raptures, but rather as illusions of the devil. Without referring to names, we find this test little applicable to claims which have been loudly urged.

Another great test is that an ecstasy comes from an evil spirit, or from a natural cause, if the mind is occupied with a multitude of thoughts and ideas of creatures, or disturbed with distorted phantasms; for in true rapture the mind, *fixed upon God alone*, and wonderfully subsisting in Him, forgets all things which are outside of Him, so that it cannot even pray for its friends, or wish anything save what He wishes. Now, in most of the revelations we have been noticing, it is astonishing how much more human interests—the love of

relations, for instance—pervade them, and how the family spirit is carried into heaven throughout them; how little or nothing there is in them of God and the love of God. Above all, the agreement of revelations with the Sacred Scriptures, with divine and apostolical traditions, with the customs and definitions of the Church, must be looked to, as the Apostle says to the Galatians—"Though an angel from heaven preach a Gospel to you besides that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema."—(Gal. i. 8.) How this test applies to the pretended revelations of the spiritualist, we need hardly invite the reader to consider. As to the alleged levitations, as Mr. Home calls them, and to the apparitions of hands, there is nothing new to the Catholic theologian in all that: nothing that will even for a moment tempt him to listen to anything that people can urge, merely on the strength of such manifestations. In a diabolical ecstasy, the body may be raised from the ground, according to Benedict XIV., for that does not exceed the Devil's power and strength; and elsewhere, quoting Arauxo, he says that the Devil "can create apparitions by an ærial body, condensing the air so that it shall assume a human form, and resemble him whom he wishes to represent. It is of faith that he has created such apparitions, when in the figure of a man he tempted Christ, fasting in the wilderness." This reminds us very much of a great deal to be met with in Mr. Home's book and elsewhere, of the formation of the apparitions of hands said to be effected by the spirits. They talk of their forming them from the vital force of those present, of their not liking imperfect members to be seen, and so forth; all which wears both a magical and a pagan air, and reminds us of the notions that prevailed among the Greeks of old, of the feeble spirit roaming through Hades, and unable to speak, save in gibbering accents, till it had tasted of blood. Let those who meddle with these things be assured they know not what they do, and that they will one day awake from their dream, disordered, in mind and body, by agencies of the most abnormal kind, entangled to such an extent with evil powers, as with great difficulty, if ever, to be recalled to a pure, simple, and harmless life. Catholics ordinarily have no call to trouble themselves with these "phenomena," as they are called. We have nothing to do with them except simply to avoid them; and this sort of contemptuous flight from evil, with humble love and confidence at the same time in the Almighty Author of all good, is just what the foul spirit hates and fears the most.

Non ragioniam di lor, ma guarda e passa.

X. F.

SCIENCE AND THE MYSTERY OF THE BLESSED EUCCHARIST.

PART I.—INTRODUCTORY.

AT all periods in the history of theological science, its important relations with the other principal departments of knowledge—with metaphysical philosophy, with physical science, with historical research—have been recognized both by those who have cultivated theology with the greatest assiduity, and by those who have held it in the lowest estimation. In all ages the objections which the enemies of Christianity have alleged against its teaching have been such as to imply, on the part of those who urged them, a clear perception of the direct connection between Christian theology and profane knowledge, and a conviction that the readiest method of disproving the pretensions of the former is by establishing a discordance between it and the latter. Hence the Church has in each successive age employed her greatest doctors in exhibiting the perfect harmony which obtains between revealed doctrine and the scientific and historic truths accepted by mankind; and the most eminent of the early Fathers devoted all their zeal and energy to the glorious toil of demonstrating that nature and grace, secular learning and sacred science, are in perfect accord with each other—that they proceed from the same source, and tend towards the same term; and can never be deemed to be at variance, save through the malice or ignorance of the superficial or the prejudiced inquirer into the relations which subsist between them. Recorded on the pages of the Church History of the first six centuries, are the names of Origen, Clement, Gregory, Athanasius, Eusebius, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, Cyril, and of several others, bearing witness that during these centuries the Church was not without many eloquent defenders. Most of these distinguished names belonged to men as eminent in secular as in sacred learning, who, when they proclaimed the alliance and agreement between philosophy and religion, did so with the authority of persons who were at once penetrated with the spirit of religion and masters of all the resources of philosophy.

If during the period which intervened between the 6th and

12th centuries there does not appear a succession of divines such as had adorned preceding times, the reason is to be found, not in any change of opinion as to the importance of worldly learning in the defence of revealed doctrine, but in the circumstance that during the latter period few attacks worthy of notice were made on the Church in the name of science. All the vast stores of learning collected by the intellectual activity of the ancient world had been exhausted, and all the difficulties which prejudice or ingenuity could suggest, had been proposed and had been met. The minds of men were engrossed with political and social changes; and amidst the breaking up of the old empire and the marking out and consolidation of the new kingdoms, there was little room, and, it may be presumed, as little inclination, for abstract controversies. There were but few intellects trained to philosophical habits of thought, and still fewer desirous of expending themselves upon inquiries which could excite no general interest. The reign of Charlemagne, or at least that portion of it during which he was at leisure to foster literary pursuits, was too brief to allow of the intellectual revival which he encouraged being a complete awakening of the mind of Western Europe from the heavy slumber into which it had sunk; the civil dissensions which followed on the partition of his empire repressed whatever slight activity had begun to show itself, and postponed for three centuries that renewal of intellectual life which, for a short time, had seemed about to take place under auspices of great promise. The awakening was postponed until the 12th century, but it was impossible that it should be deferred beyond that epoch.

Various causes combined to give the intellectual impulse which marks the commencement and progress of the 12th century. Among these may be mentioned the institution of universities, the cultivation of the vernacular and hitherto unformed languages of Europe, and a return to the study of the Latin. To these, and as their consequence, may be added the multiplication of books. Much influence has also been attributed to the early Moorish cultivation. From the commencement of the 8th century, the south-west of Europe had become the abode of an Eastern race gifted with great mental acuteness and characterized by a restless eagerness in the search after knowledge. The Saracens offer, perhaps, the solitary exception of a people brought under the degrading influence of Mahometanism, who attained any intellectual pre-eminence or made any progress in letters. A land which, during ten centuries of occupancy by the Carthaginians, the Romans, and the Visigoths, had been hardly known to litera-

ture, save by the accident of having given birth to a Seneca or a Lucan, and as little known to theology, except by the repute of its national councils, had become, in the 10th and succeeding centuries, the centre of a vigorous movement at once literary and philosophical. Cordova especially, and, more or less, every Moorish city, abounded in schools of learning, at which professors publicly lectured on all the branches of knowledge, and to which students resorted, not only from Christian Spain, but from all parts of Europe, longing to be instructed in the lore of the Arabians, and to learn from Moorish interpreters the wisdom of Aristotle. Undoubtedly the Moors must be regarded as having, in a great measure, influenced the revival of learning in Europe; but this influence has sometimes been overrated. Their schools or colleges cannot be regarded as the models of the mediæval universities, from which they essentially differed. Materially, the Moors of Spain were far in advance of the less polished nations in process of formation under the civilizing action of Christianity. In physical and mathematical science especially they had made great progress, and it was well known how early and how diligently Aristotle was commentated by the Arabians, and through their means chiefly became first familiar to the learned of Europe. Yet it may be questioned if the Moors possessed in any degree the true philosophic spirit, however much, by exciting a spirit of emulation, they may have promoted the revival of philosophical studies in western Christendom. Every species of activity is contagious, and none more so than the activity of intellectual effort; and to them, therefore, must be ascribed their share in fostering the interest in abstract studies which sprang up universally at the beginning of the 12th century, through the medium of the scholars who had frequented their schools, and who, in returning to their own countries, carried their intellectual attainments to the more fruitful soil of Christian Europe. Everywhere this mental activity displayed itself about the same time, and soon the populous cities of France and Germany, and even the sequestered retreats far removed from the turmoil of city life, the picturesque solitudes of Bec and of Troyes, became conscious of an interest and an energy hitherto unfelt, and of being quickened by a spirit as all-pervading as even the excitement of political or of civil strife.

The diffusion of a taste for philosophy is, from the nature of the case, the immediate prelude of an intellectual warfare. The domain of thought is pre-eminently the domain of freedom; not indeed the domain within which absolute freedom can be legitimately claimed or safely conceded, but

one within which much liberty may be permitted without peril of its degenerating into license. When a vast number of thinkers begin to speculate, there will necessarily be variety and disagreement in the speculations; and the 12th and 13th centuries consequently became a season characterized by the almost infinite diversity of the philosophic theories to which it gave birth, and, as a result of this, by the vigilance with which the Church watched over its own privileges, and the vigour with which it enforced its claim to supremacy over the human mind. The method by which the Church asserted its right to control human reason, and to retain it in the obedience of faith, was the same as that which it has always followed. It defined clearly its own doctrines, added to them the safeguard of spiritual censures, and satisfied the difficulties of opponents by a calm and conclusive demonstration of their errors. Knowing that its authority had been given to it for edification, and not for destruction, it raised up a great school of religious philosophy, whose special mission it was to manifest to the world the perfect accord between the deposit of faith and the deductions of reason. S. Thomas Aquinas, John Duns Scotus, S. Bonaventura, were among the first doctors of the new school, and it has continued during six centuries to be graced by a succession of teachers not unworthy of such forerunners, reckoning on its list, more than four hundred years after its foundation, such illustrious names as those of Suarez, Vasquez, Viva, and De Lugo.

Throughout the entire period during which the mediæval school was dominant, the theologians who belonged to it faithfully remembered the circumstances in which it had originated. S. Thomas's great work, the "*Summa Totius Theologiæ*," embodies much of what was most valued in the metaphysics, and—in so far as related to the subjects of which he treated—in the physics of his day; and some of the later scholastic works, for instance the treatises of Cardinal de Lugo, are, wherever the allusion is appropriate, replete with references to the Aristotelian physics, and to the other branches of the Aristotelian philosophy. During the centuries in which these theologians wrote, to compare theology with the Aristotelian science was to give an exhaustive exposition of the relations between science and theology. The Aristotelian science was that almost universally acquiesced in; and the disregard for it which was growing somewhat general towards the close of the 17th century, had now become sufficiently pronounced to necessitate the adjustment of theology in reference to any other scientific system.

The Aristotelian physics were overthrown in the 17th

century; the Aristotelian metaphysics were at the same period called in question, and rejected by many for the sake of the new metaphysical tenets of Descartes. The philosophy of Descartes formed the starting-point of the severance between scientific inquiry and theology; and although the Catholic doctors who accepted Cartesian principles—and the acceptance was by no means universal—did not adopt or accept the evil consequences in which those principles issued, nevertheless the amount of influence which the new philosophy obtained was sufficient to weaken the confidence hitherto felt in the metaphysical teaching grounded on Aristotle's system. At the same time, physical science, unexpectedly enriched with such mechanical instruments as the microscope, the telescope, and the balance, and with the still more valuable mental instruments of logarithms and the calculus, advanced with a marvellous progress; and while it exhibited by contrast the poverty and wordiness of the scholastic physics, brought by a natural consequence even the scholastic metaphysics into disrepute. When the scholastic system had lost its *prestige*, there remained no great and consistent body of philosophical doctrine to which men could do homage as of pre-eminent authority. The demand for such a system led, as is usual, to several attempts to supply it; and the names of Spinoza, Wolff, Kant, Schilling, Fichte, and Hegel, pass in rapid succession before us as those of the bold and reckless thinkers who aspired to occupy the thrones from which Aristotle and Aquinas had been deposed.

When we consider that, on the one hand, the connection between the former physics, whose relations towards theology had been determined, and the modern physics, had been completely sundered; and that, on the other hand, the elder metaphysics had ceased to be prized as valuable secular learning, and that the newer metaphysics were rapidly changing form, and incessantly fluctuating in every detail, it will not be difficult to understand why later theologians have devoted in general little attention to the study of the scientific aspects of theology. It cannot excite surprise that the scientific portion, or what should be the scientific portion, in the greater number of recent theological works, is either omitted or dealt with incompletely; it cannot excite surprise, but at the same time it cannot fail to excite regret. That the relations between Catholic divinity and both physical and mental science are numerous and important, does not admit of doubt; and that in recent times these relations have not been investigated with the fulness and accuracy which they need is equally incontestable. It is no exaggeration to say, that it is

not possible to point out, among the various treatises "*De Vera Religione*," a single one which satisfies the requirements of such a work; that there is no modern treatise on the theology of the Blessed Eucharist which does for modern philosophy what Cardinal De Lugo accomplished for the mediæval philosophy in his learned volume on that August Mystery; that there is no means, save by gleaning from scattered dissertations and pamphlets, of becoming acquainted with the doctrinal connections of a science at once so profound and so widely studied as Physiology.* These are but a few of the instances that might be cited, but they are sufficient to indicate a want, whose existence no one who is conversant with recent theological literature can deny. How important it is that this want should be supplied may be easily comprehended by any one who considers the essentially scientific character of the present age, or who observes the momentous fact that some of the heaviest and most persevering attacks which have been made upon Revelation in our time have been made, not, indeed, with the sanction, but at least in the name of science.

The human mind is lifted up by the greatness of its own achievements; it has effected the conquest long anticipated and foreshadowed both by superstition and by philosophy; it has bent the stubborn forces of nature to its control; asserted the essential supremacy over matter which belongs to spirit; and, as has been eloquently said, "has weighed the heavens, and made the lightning its messenger." Wielding with ease the mightiest and most destructive forces, transmuting the rude and undisciplined physical powers which once overawed and led it captive into the tractable ministers of its will, it forgets, while contemplating the grandeur of its triumph, how utterly powerless may even the faculties which have produced these stupendous results become when they seek to explore the counsels of God, and to determine without supernatural guidance the mysteries of man's origin and destiny. As weakness

* Apart from the many interesting points of connection between physiology and moral theology, dogmatic theology has close and important links of connection with that science. As an example of my meaning, it will be at present sufficient to refer to the doctrinal importance of the discussions which have recently excited so much interest on the Continent respecting the relations between the "thinking soul" (*l'âme pensante*) and the "vital principle" (*principe vital*). The course of physiological inquiry is leading men back in the direction of the old traditional teaching, which identified the soul with the vital principle; an opinion, it need scarcely be said, more in harmony with S. Thomas's doctrine of the soul being the *form* of the body, than the duodynamistic theories that have prevailed in the medical schools of modern times.

which is felt and recognized becomes by the very recognition an occasion of strength, so also strength which is over-prized engenders presumption, and becomes a source of weakness; and thus it has happened, that at this, its period of unprecedented development, science has given the most evident proofs that it is strong only when restrained within its appropriate limits, and that inevitable failure awaits it when it trespasses beyond its own domain.

Although the deficiency in theological literature which I have noticed exists to no inconsiderable extent, I should be expressing myself inaccurately were I to convey the impression that large materials, easily available for its remedy, had not been already accumulated, through individual and dissociated labours. Perrone, in his valuable "*Prælectiones Theologicæ*," has collected, after a rather encyclopædic fashion, numerous important facts and theories, and has augmented the value of his compilation by appending to his statements references to the authorities in which each separate item will be found more fully elucidated. Bergier's Dictionary, though not up to the demands of the present day, is yet a work of considerable merit and utility for the purposes of which I am speaking, but will probably be superseded, as a book of reference, by the "*Dictionnaire Encyclopédique de la Théologie Catholique*," the product of the united labours of the most learned Catholics of Germany, a translation of which into French has already reached its twentieth volume. Many also of the writings of Professor Ubaghs, as well as of M. Waterkeyn, and several others, go no little way towards supplying the want which is universally felt to exist. I specify the foregoing, not as forming even an approximately complete list, but merely as affording a specimen of the class of contributions to which I allude, while I omit all reference to the almost exhaustless materials on theologico-scientific subjects which are at hand in the secular periodical literature, and in the able treatises on the connection between revelation and science which have emanated whether from Catholic or Protestant divines; my object being, not to indicate the attitude of religious literature in regard generally to profane studies, but to point out the peculiar condition of the present relation between those studies and Catholic theology.

I will only further observe that the want above alluded to must be regarded rather as the inevitable result of circumstances than as matter of reproach to Catholic theologians and doctors. The last three centuries, notwithstanding the immense progress that has been made in physical science, have been a period of disorganization, philosophical no less

than social and political. The Church, divinely guided, never commits herself to new and untried theories, nor to any scientific or philosophical teaching, as such; she bides her time, contenting herself meanwhile with condemning whatever is plainly and palpably at variance with the faith. When the opportune season arrives for co-ordinating and connecting scientific teaching with theology, Providence fails not to raise up those who are equal to the task. Such a season we may now perhaps expect, seeing that the progress of science itself is tending to demonstrate the unsoundness of many of the views of the modern schools that have sprung up since the so-called emancipation of science from theology; nay more, that it is leading men back to not a few of the old discarded opinions of mediæval Christendom, as considered apart from their technical Aristotelian forms.

These preliminary observations have been carried to a length so much beyond what I had intended, that I shall, without further preface, enter upon the immediate subject of the present paper; viz., the examination of the important question which is discussed in the volumes* whose titles I have given below. I shall only interpose a few words respecting two of the authors in question—the Spanish Cardinal and the Louvain Professor.

Cardinal John de Lugo was a native of Spain, and was born about the year 1583. At an early age he attached himself to the Order of Jesus, and for several years taught theology and philosophy, with great applause, in various Spanish colleges. He was ultimately transferred to Rome, and created Cardinal by Urban VIII. about 1643. He died, aged seventy-seven, in the year 1660. He had relinquished a large patrimony, in order to embrace the mortified life of a religious, and is recorded to have been as conspicuous for his tenderness towards the poor, and his unaffected simplicity, as for the vastness of his attainments, and the rare union of a marvellous subtlety of mind with a most solid judgment. His work on the Eucharist is universally regarded as one of the completest dissertations on that mystery which has ever been published

* *Du Dynamisme considéré en lui-même et dans ses rapports avec la Sainte Eucharistie.* Par G. C. Ubachs, Président du Collège du Saint-Esprit, à l'Université Catholique de Louvain, &c. Louvain: Vanlinthout. 1861.

Tractatus de Venerabili Eucharistiæ Sacramento. Auctore Johanne De Lugo, Cardinali S.R.E. Lugduni. 1644.

The Holy Communion: its Philosophy, Theology, and Practice. By John Bernard Dalgairns, Priest of the Oratory of S. Philip Neri. Dublin: Duffy. 1861.

—completest, that is, as regards the moral and scholastic, as distinguished from the dogmatic aspects of the subject.

Professor Ubaghs occupies an eminent position among the Catholic philosophers of the present age. He is "Professeur ordinaire à la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres" in the University of Louvain, and has, during several years past, produced a great variety of works on many of the most intricate and interesting questions in abstract philosophy. Perhaps the most generally known of these works are the "*Logicæ Elementa*," his "*Précis de Psychologie*," and his "*Essai d'Idéologie Ontologique*." He is a conspicuous defender of the doctrine of realism in its most extreme form—in the form in which it seems to have been maintained by S. Anselm and Odo, Bishop of Cambrai. Professor Ubaghs, besides being endowed with great mental acumen, and being master of very diversified resources of learning, is undoubtedly gifted with considerable comprehensiveness of intellect. I am of opinion, however, that some deduction must be made from the practical value of these qualities, in consequence of his enthusiastic temperament, which often impels him to act as a partisan, where he should rather discharge the office of a judge; and in consequence also of a very noticeable leaning on his part towards an idealism in speculation, which, to ordinary readers of his works, may appear to savour strongly of mysticism. How far the foregoing estimate of the mental calibre of the two eminent writers mentioned is justified by the special evidences furnished by the volumes under notice, will best appear from the examination to which they will be subjected, in the process of discussing the momentous problem with which they deal.

It would be superfluous to introduce the name of Father Dalgairns with any attempted enumeration of the many good services which he has rendered to religion. His name is so well and so honourably known to my readers, that I only give expression to a judgment which will be ratified by all, in affirming that, both in his philosophical and devotional works, he well sustains the traditionary repute of the illustrious Congregation to which he belongs.

It would be impossible to overrate the importance of the problem to the discussion of which this paper is devoted. That within the narrow circumference of the Sacred Host should be contained the Ineffable Majesty of the Incarnate God; that beneath the fragile and almost transparent environment of the accidents, should be hidden the Figure of the Father's Substance and the Splendour of His Glory; that

the Divine Person should undergo this astounding humiliation, and become the food of a creature whose body is fashioned from the clay, is so great a mystery, one so infinitely exalted above the reach of the human understanding—that to refuse assent to it, when proposed on adequate grounds, on the sole pretext that its reality cannot be proved to the satisfaction of that understanding, would be as unreasonable, in an intellectual point of view, as it would be opposed to the submission required by faith. To a Catholic it is sufficient that the mystery rests on the testimony of God Himself—that it forms part of the deposit of revealed truth, and is proposed to him by the infallible authority of the Church. The Protestant, on his own principles, ought to rest satisfied with sufficient proof that the doctrine is actually contained in Scripture. If it belong to a sphere above the competence of reason, it cannot be proved to be repugnant to reason merely because it is inexplicable to it. All he can require is that, in the terms of its enunciation, it should not be self-contradictory. The mystery of the Blessed Trinity may here be instanced. Were we required to believe that God is Three in the same sense in which He is One—here would be impossibility, because there would be contradiction. But as the Protestant believer does not allow the right to deny the truth of that mystery on the ground of its simple inexplicability, so neither can he consistently claim such right as respects the Blessed Eucharist.

The heat of the controversy between Catholics and Protestants may be said to rage around the great central dogma of the Real Presence. With this dogma all the rest of the Catholic system is in a peculiar manner connected: the very nature of the affirmation it contains, the import of the truth of which it is an expression, give to it an especially dominant and peculiar character. If a believer in the veracity of the Bible be convinced, from his examination of the sacred record, that the doctrine of the Real Presence is taught in it, there is no doubt but that he will experience small difficulty in assenting to the other points of Catholic doctrine. If he be persuaded that the Redeemer intended that His own Presence should be perpetuated on earth under the sacramental species, he will naturally be drawn towards the Church in which the doctrine is preserved in all its purity, and in which it is defined with all the precision, and guarded with all the vigilance, which the deepest conviction and the most affectionate zeal can suggest and secure.

The tenet of the Real Presence, therefore, being one of exceptional importance, even in Catholic teaching, it becomes a

matter of considerable moment to determine what are the principles in accordance with which it should be examined; what are the tests of its truth which may reasonably be applied by the member of any other religious body, who may be disposed to inquire into its claims upon his acceptance. A person who has acquiesced in the authority of the Church to propound articles of faith, is already in principle committed to a full submission to all the doctrines it proposes; we have, therefore, only to contemplate the case of one who takes the inspired volume as his sole rule of faith; the position, it may be observed, occupied by every consistent follower of the founders of Protestantism. Is such a person, when he reads in the New Testament the words of promise, or the words of institution, when he considers the circumstances in which the words were spoken, the context, whether of language or of fact, by which they are surrounded and affected, when he discovers no sufficient reason in any of these for attributing to them a metaphorical meaning, is he yet justified by the true principles of criticism in construing them figuratively, solely because it appears to him that the *literal realization is physically impossible*? This is an important question; and even some Protestant divines are entirely of opinion that there is no room in the examination of the Scriptural evidence of the Real Presence for any scientific analysis of the subject-matter. They acknowledge that the words employed by Christ are to be examined according to the sound principles which it is customary to employ in ascertaining the meaning of language. "Our business," writes Dr. Stanley Faber,* "most plainly is, not to discuss the abstract absurdity or the imagined contradictoriness of Transubstantiation, but to inquire, according to the best means we possess, whether it be indeed a doctrine of Holy Scripture. If sufficient evidence shall determine such to be the case, we may be sure that the doctrine is neither absurd nor contradictory. I shall ever contend that the doctrine of Transubstantiation, like the doctrine of the Trinity, is a question of pure evidence." The opposite view is adopted by Horne, in his "Introduction," and by Dr. Tomline, in his "Elements of Theology," but upon the weakest possible grounds. From the words used by the speaker, from the circumstances in which the words are used, from the context and other such external indications of the speaker's meaning, listeners or readers are accustomed to infer what signification they ought to attach to a passage or to a discourse. If it appear to them that what the speaker advances is absurd or impossible, they

* "Difficulties of Romanism," p. 54.

do not therefore doubt the unquestionable indications supplied to them, that he did in fact advance the absurd or contradictory statement. They may marvel at it, they may wonder that it should have been uttered, they may refuse to credit it, as being impossible or nonsensical; but in so doing they reject and condemn the authority of the speaker who had proposed it. This is the natural corollary of the laws which regulate the meaning of language, and inevitably places those who refuse to take the words of promise or of institution in their literal sense, *merely* because of an assumed impossibility in the realization of the mystery, in a position precisely analogous to that of the Capharnaïtes, who justified their abandonment of Christ with the allegation, "This is a hard saying, and who can hear it?" It is therefore by no means incumbent on the Catholic who would render a reason for the faith that is in him, to satisfy the scientific scruples which infidels, or any class of Protestants, may feel respecting the possibility or impossibility of Transubstantiation. The part of the Catholic is to show that if the passages in Holy Writ, in which this mystery is spoken of, be interpreted in conformity with the principles which are followed in the interpretation of every other text of the same volume, and of every profane author, the Real Presence will be established on the incontrovertible testimony of Christ, "Who has the words of Eternal Life."

But though the *necessary* functions of the Catholic theologian are circumscribed within these boundaries, he must nevertheless take account of the fact that there are not a few who reject this mystery mainly because of some fancied contradictoriness in its subject-matter, and who justify to themselves their refusal to accept it by their conviction that Transubstantiation is manifestly and essentially impossible; that it involves a repugnance to reason so absolute and so complete, as to be necessarily beyond the power of the Almighty Himself to effect. However inconsistent such a course may be, the fact remains that many do thus reject it; and consequently the necessity arises to examine the value of their difficulties; not as though the examination were needed to the full establishment of the Catholic doctrine, but because the Church desires to be "all to all;" to condescend to the weakness of the infirm, to satisfy, if need be, even unreasonable requirements, and to take away the very pretext of an excuse from those who reject its teaching.

The whole of this important controversy obviously turns upon the comparison of two terms,—the idea which science supplies to us of the nature and condition of matter, and the idea with which the Church furnishes us of the nature of the

mystery of Transubstantiation. If either of these ideas be imperfectly apprehended, a proper comparison will be impossible, and the only result which can be reached is a confession of the impossibility of determining to what degree the two ideas are in mutual harmony or are mutually irreconcilable. Should any one be persuaded that it is not granted to the human mind, in its present state of imperfect knowledge, to acquire a correct conception of the mode in which matter exists, such a person is not in a position to allege the irreconcilability of the Real Presence therewith as an argument against the express declarations of our Saviour. In order to be competent to pronounce upon the incompatibility of two ideas, it is necessary that the relations between the two ideas be understood, or, at least, that there be a sufficiently clear apprehension of the import of each of them, such as will enable a person to perceive a clear contradictoriness in their combination. Those who profess an entire ignorance of the constitution of corporeal beings, are plainly not entitled to affirm whether that constitution be irreconcilable with the doctrine of Transubstantiation or not. The doctrine of Transubstantiation affirms certain propositions concerning the corporeal essence, and on the truth or falsehood of these propositions they are, by their own avowal, unfitted to offer any judgment whatever.

This observation is not without its applicability in the present state of English philosophical opinion. Since the question relative to the nature and existence of matter was raised by Dr. Berkeley, English philosophers have evinced a disinclination to speak dogmatically regarding its condition or essence. Although Berkeley was unable (and, I may add, unwilling) to dislodge the innate conviction which attributes reality to the external world, he was successful in analyzing with great skill and subtlety the mental data upon which the proof of the existence of matter had been generally supposed to be founded. He succeeded in diminishing the confidence which had been felt in the assumed correspondence between the outer universe and the inner microcosm, and in rendering others more cautious in arguing from mental phenomena to the character of the outward realities with which they are supposed to be connected. According to the judgment of such an eminent authority as John Stuart Mill,* it may be laid down as a truth, both obvious in itself and admitted by all whom it is at present necessary to take into consideration, that of the outward world we know and can know nothing except the sensation

* "System of Logic," vol. i. p. 66.

which we experience from it; and Dr. Mansell, in his Metaphysics, subscribes to precisely the same opinion. So far as the knowledge we derive from the senses alone is concerned, this is incontestable. The senses apprise us of nothing beyond their own experience. Our belief in the objective reality of the objects of sense cannot be derived from the senses themselves. It is an intuitive intellectual conception (as I shall have occasion to notice hereafter), which we are neither free to reject, nor competent to prove.* But the inference is obvious: if the senses cannot guarantee to us the substantial existence of matter, much less can the experimental information we receive from them give us any knowledge of its essence or substance.

To trace in detail the several theories of matter which have been advanced by distinguished philosophers would be incompatible with the design of the present paper, and would necessarily introduce many particulars which, however interesting in themselves and important in their bearing on the respective systems, would be irrelevant to the purpose I desire to keep exclusively in view. I believe that the most convenient mode of treating the present subject is, firstly, to state what are the opinions with which science supplies us concerning the nature of matter; and, secondly, to inquire in what way these opinions bear upon the dogma of Transubstantiation. It is not my design to base my conclusions upon one special view respecting the constitution of matter, to the exclusion of other theories, entertained, it may be, by great schools of philosophy. It will rather be my object to show that there is nothing in any of the philosophic systems, in so far as they are supported by solid reasoning, which conflicts with what Faith requires the Catholic to hold in consequence of his belief in the Real Presence of Jesus Christ in the Blessed Eucharist. Neither, on the other hand, is it my wish to attach undue importance to the sentiments of particular theological schools within the Church, or to treat the present topic as though explanations of the Mystery which may be most popular with theologians were therefore a necessary portion of dogma, and to be necessarily accepted together with the truth with which they are associated. I will state the *minimum* of scientific admission with which the Church will be content; or rather, the assertions sometimes put forward as though of scientific value, which the Church pronounces to be incompatible with the truth of the Mystery

* "Est autem differentia inter intellectum et sensum; nam sensus apprehendit rem quantum ad exteriora ejus accidentia, quæ sunt color, sapor, quantitas, et alia hujusmodi, sed intellectus ingreditur ad interiora rei."—*Contra Gent.*, lib. iv. c. 44.

of Transubstantiation. The advantages of this mode of discussing the subject are apparent. It will have the effect of placing apart—and unconfused by less important details—the exact series of propositions, the falsehood of which is implied in the truth of the Real Presence, and the determinate surrender of which the Church demands from all who would acquiesce in its teaching. Propositions which, in the language of theologians, are said to be placed “in ordine fidei,” appertain with more or less directness to the deposit of faith, and the negation of them incurs the censure of heresy, of erroneousness, of temerity, or some note of less severe import, in proportion to the degree in which the virtue of faith is offended by the rejection of them. In everything that belongs to the elucidation of Catholic doctrine, it is of consequence to separate assertions affected by any of these marks from those which, whether entertained by many or by few individuals, may yet be held even by the minority without any risk of ecclesiastical censure. While all that has been just observed is perfectly true, it would be a serious mistake to use the reflections there made as a plea for in any way undervaluing the prevailing sentiments among the majority of Catholic divines, even where their sentiments are not indorsed by any ecclesiastical definition; as their opinions carry with them great weight, both because of the value attaching to any opinion emanating from such a source, and also because their tendency affords a probable ground for inferring what is the bias of the Church itself, and what may, through its express declaration, become at some future time of higher value than at present attaches to it.

Before entering upon an analysis of the scientific notion of the nature of matter, it will be well to advert to the popular notion on the subject. The popular notion is in reality the stronghold of error regarding this important question. The popular notion and the scientific notion on this subject, as on many others, do not differ from one another as being opposed or unlike, but in degree and in point of accuracy. The operations of all our faculties are complex. With respect at least to anything outside ourselves, we are not endowed with pure intuition of an object. The intellect, it is true, intuitively grasps the existence of a reality as the subject of the phenomena of which the senses are cognisant, but it does not intuitively perceive that reality or substance itself. Whatever, therefore, we do know of the external world, we know by interpreting the testimony of our senses. Our senses are not trustworthy witnesses, unless their action be invested with certain conditions. One of our

faculties—the imagination—is closely related to sense; it operates by means of sensible images, and there are but few intellectual processes in which it does not take a part. It is a mere truism to remark that there are numerous sources of prejudice and error; that in this, as in other cases, “a man’s enemies are those of his own household;” and that many of the errors most difficult of detection have their origin in the circumstance that the intellect does not make sufficient deduction for the ever-occurring influences which reside in the imagination and in the senses. Again, although the construction of language, and common sense itself, unconsciously bear witness to the fact noticed above, that while the senses are conversant with and make known to us the properties and qualities of the objects in the external world with which they bring us into connection, they have no discernment of that which the pure intellect alone perceives—this truth is vaguely apprehended or quite overlooked by the popular mind.

It is the duty, then, of the intellect, not only to scrutinize by comparison and analysis, the report it receives from the senses and the imagination, and to subject it to a sifting process; but to distinguish between the perceptions which it derives from these sources and that which accompanies them; viz., the necessary belief in the objective reality of the external world, or, in other words, in the existence of material substance; a pure conception of the intellect, with which the senses have no concern. The result of this examination is the formation of what is properly designated “a scientific notion.” The scientific notion, in a word, is the popular notion amended and corrected. It is, therefore, plainly only the scientific idea of matter with which we have here to deal. The popular idea represents matter as something extended, gross, heavy, and impenetrable; for the most part passive, although permeated, or, it may be, energized by active and subtle forces;—an idea not erroneous when taken only as the representative of the impressions with which our senses and imagination furnish us, and which our reflections upon the data thus supplied may deduce therefrom. But any one who rests in this conception, as a definition of that which constitutes the essence as distinguished from the properties and phenomena of matter, will be led to regard the mystery of Transubstantiation as physically impossible. That he should do so, and should deem it impossible that the same body should be in two places at a time, is no more wonderful than that any one who adopts a thoroughly wrong principle should, to be consistent with himself, acquiesce in a thoroughly wrong

conclusion. At the mere mention of the Real Presence, the unbeliever will observe that it is directly opposed to the most obvious properties of matter—that it is a self-evident contradiction. It is sufficient to reply that it is indeed in some sense opposed to the most obvious properties of matter,—the *most obvious*, but therefore the *least essential*. The truth is, he rests his objection upon the popular conception of matter; if he would argue at all, or would even provide himself with an efficacious plea to justify his rejection of the doctrine, he must show some conflict between the doctrine and the essential nature of matter, as that nature is exhibited by philosophy conducting its investigations according to the most appropriate methods of inquiry.

T. F. M.

(To be continued.)

Notices of Books.

The Religious and Social Position of Catholics in England: an Address delivered to the Catholic Congress of Malines, August 21st, 1863. By His Eminence Cardinal WISEMAN. Translated from the French. Dublin: Duffy. 1864.

THE most prominent advantage derived from such a Congress as that of Malines is the promotion of mutual knowledge and of mutual sympathy among the Catholics of all nations. There could not, therefore, be a more appropriate subject for an address at the Congress than that allotted to Cardinal Wiseman; nor, we may add, could the subject have been treated in a more interesting and appropriate way. The address is extremely well suited for the audience to which, and the circumstances under which, it was actually delivered.

But, after all, English Catholics are even more interested in the matter which it treats than foreigners can be, however generous and sympathizing; and we hail, therefore, with lively satisfaction its appearance in an English dress. Its prominent characteristics are precisely the most suited to its theme: truthfulness, simplicity, and an entire absence of all vague generalities and of all rhetorical declamation. The Cardinal gives us a "plain unvarnished tale" of facts, and leaves his readers to draw their own conclusions. On the one hand, His Eminence does not attempt to exaggerate the influence of Catholics in England: "they form," he says (p. 49), "a small minority scattered thinly over the country, except in a few parts and in some large towns. Out of these, their power and influence as electors is almost null." And he frankly admits (p. 18) that "there must still remain at least 17,000 poor [Catholic] children who attend no school, or only Protestant schools. This is," he adds, "an unspeakable sorrow, which I share with all the faithful of my diocese." On the other hand, where treating the more pleasing theme of Catholic progress, he rests his case throughout on statistical facts which do not admit of inaccuracy or mistake. And the progress which His Eminence has to record is undoubtedly a cause for deep thankfulness to Almighty God.

There is one promised measure, mentioned by the Cardinal, which in itself and by itself may perhaps be the germ of a more solid and pervasive Catholic development than all the rest put together. We allude to "that which was decided in" the "last" provincial "synod,—the foundation of an ecclesiastical seminary in every diocese" (p. 28).

One of the author's remarks is characteristically generous and self-deprecating. "It is not to London," he says, "that one must go to contemplate the visible and material growth of Catholicity in England. . . . This is an

acknowledgment which I am glad to make to the honour of my dear brethren of the English Episcopate, far more worthy than myself of the high mission to which they consecrate themselves with so much real devotedness and self-denial" (p. 14). We must be allowed, however, to doubt whether our holy religion has not made progress as genuine and extensive (to say the very least) in the diocese of Westminster as in any other English diocese whatever.

It is perhaps hardly right to panegyricize the ecclesiastical acts of our superiors; because to do so might seem to imply a claim of expressing on occasion an adverse comment on such acts; a claim, we need hardly say, which no good Catholic would concede, and which we would be the very last to make. Yet we may be allowed to say one thing on which all are unanimous. If there is one cause more than another to which we may attribute the advance made by Catholicism in the diocese of Westminster, it is the sympathy shown by our Cardinal Archbishop with *every* project of good submitted to his notice: the enlarged wisdom whereby he has encouraged *all* to work for God, however various in character and endowments, each in the way of his own special attraction and vocation. There is no English Catholic, except the Cardinal himself, who could have spoken or written on the progress of Catholicism among us without giving a prominent place to this particular topic.

De Unitate Romana Commentarius. CLEMENS SCHRADER, S. J. Liber I. Friburgi Brisgovie: Herder. 1862.

FATHER SCHRADER, who was for some years Professor of Dogmatic Theology in the Roman College, and who has now for six years taught the same science at the University of Vienna, has given to the world, in this "Commentary on Roman Unity," the first instalment of what promises to be an elaborate and valuable work. The subject which he handles has always been one of vital importance to the Church. It has been already treated of by so long a list of able writers, that some may think that it has been almost worn threadbare, and wonder that an eminent theologian of the present day should publish a work on so trite a topic. But we venture to say that even a cursory glance at the author's table of contents will convince any instructed person of the contrary. He will there see that F. Schrader has not followed tamely in any beaten path, nor shrunk from the task of handling scientifically a large number of incidental questions of especial interest at the present time. Indeed we cannot but think this publication peculiarly opportune. A providential movement seems to have arisen of late amongst the schismatic Greeks towards Catholic unity; and, on the other hand, the spirit of evil is making more than ordinary efforts to draw off a large portion of the Latin race from their allegiance to the Holy See. As S. Peter in days of old was divinely appointed to war from the centre of the Roman empire upon ancient heathenism, and to wrestle in the very stronghold of superstition with the anti-Christian powers of darkness, so now it would seem as if, by way of reprisal, the enemy of God and man were bent upon bringing about the ruin of Christianity by concentrating his attacks upon the centre of the whole visible kingdom of

Christ. All the members are assailed in their head. S. Peter's successor, the Vicar of Christ, is the main object of anti-Christian warfare as it is now carried on. But our special purpose in drawing attention to F. Schrader's book is its suitability to the existing state of things in England. Much as we may distrust the "Union" party as a whole, we cannot but discern the sign of a deeply earnest spirit among some of the individuals who compose it; and it would seem almost impossible that men in such dispositions should read works like this of F. Schrader's and not be convinced that Christian unity and Roman unity are identical, and that, therefore, there can be no return to the former without unconditional surrender to the latter. This once seen, we should hear no more of alliances which, on true Catholic principles, are absolutely impossible. Corporate union would fade from before their eyes as a delusive dream, and it would be felt that personal action, personal submission to *Roman Unity*, is nothing more or less than an imperious duty, seeing that by every moment of delay a strictly personal risk is incurred,—that most fearful of all risks which beings on their trial for Eternity can run.

Of course, F. Schrader writes as a theologian addressing theologians. There is no light reading in his pages. They are meant for earnest-minded men, who do not shrink from the severer studies, and are capable of patient investigation. We must content ourselves by giving a brief outline of the work, its scope and method.

The author's object is to prove that *Roman Unity* (so called, because its determining principle is the Roman and Apostolic See) is the sum and substance of the whole Christian economy, and therefore equivalent to Christian Truth, as taught and maintained under the auspices, and by the authority of S. Peter, who lives and reigns uninterruptedly, and for ever, in the Roman Church.

The work opens with a proof, resting on incontestable authorities, of the identity of the Catholic faith and Church with the Roman faith and Church. This proved, the author at once passes on to the explanation and development of the peculiar properties of this unity. These are no other than the properties of the society called the Church, looked at in the light of its end, origin, and nature. From the first point of view it is of obligation at once, in virtue of a positive precept, and as an indispensable means of salvation, like the Sacrament of Baptism itself. In its origin, it is a society, the form and existence of which spring from the determining will of a legitimate superior,—Christ Himself. It is a body politic, with the conditions of its existence all prescribed. Christ, the Supreme Legislator, settled the mode of aggregation to this community,—Baptism; the terms of membership,—faith; the material objects of that faith, and the extent of practical obligations,—“all things whatsoever I have commanded you;” He instituted the office of teacher, and established an authentic tribunal, with supreme power to maintain integrity of doctrine, to enact laws, to judge, and to punish; and lastly, He chose and appointed those who were to possess this power in the first instance, and hand it on to a teaching and governing body that was to last till the end of time in a determinate hierarchical form. And if we look at the nature or constitution of this community, we shall find that it was not established on democratical principles. Its members were not to be on an

equality either in the exercise or the possession of their respective rights. Clergy and laity were to fall each into its proper place, with distinct rights and separate functions; and the clergy itself was to be organized upon the same hierarchic principle, and distinguished into various grades, like the rulers of a kingdom, or the organs of the human body.

But more than this, the Christian community was to be one, visibly one, with a most perfect and conspicuous oneness; such, that the eyes of men should be able to recognize its Divine origin precisely by this characteristic.

Now, the teachings of tradition, based upon Revelation, prove that each and all of these properties are to be found in *Roman Unity*, and in no other. There they become concrete, are individualized, are sensibly and palpably realized. And hence it follows that Roman Unity is a thing as necessary as the Catholic Church, or rather that the two are one, or the one a personification of the other.

Upon this principle depend a number of important corollaries, which F. Schrader has worked out with particular care. Amongst others we may mention the inalienable independence of the Church, the imperative necessity of being a member of this Church, the attitude of respect and submission which all are bound to maintain towards its lawfully constituted authorities, the duty of refraining from any interference with the legitimate acts of ecclesiastical judges; in a word, the duty, incumbent on individuals, and all civil bodies alike, of recognizing and leaving intact all the rights of this perfect and independent society—the Church. These topics are all scientifically handled in this work. It would be well if some of our Catholic *littérateurs*, especially of the more popular sort, would study and ponder deeply the principles there laid down, before indulging in smart writing upon the relations of Church and State, and the duties and shortcomings of Churchmen, the necessity that lies upon the Church of trimming to the times, or, as they word it, adapting herself to the altered circumstances of society, and the progress of the race. Perhaps they would then see that the authorities of the Church are not at liberty to depart from the laws given by her Divine Founder, or to renounce in the smallest particular the rights intrusted to them, and inherent in their office. Perhaps then they would not chafe and fret at the exercise by ecclesiastical authorities of their judicial power, or at the tone of conscious authority in which the Church addresses the civil powers of Europe. Perhaps they would learn in time the dangerousness to themselves, in a spiritual point of view, of criticising or assailing in the concrete rights which they cannot but profess to respect in the abstract. For God Himself it is who vested those rights in men of His own selection, whom He has protected by the most awful sanctions. Nice distinctions between person and office will not avail here. To weaken, undermine, infringe but one of those rights as possessed and exercised, is to weaken, undermine, infringe at once Divine right, ecclesiastical right, natural right, and—wheresoever the Church enjoys civil rights in whatever degree—the very rights of the State also. So dangerous a thing is it, and of such wide consequences, to meddle with any part, function, or relation of that divinely constituted mechanism, the living, visible, concrete, working Church.

In his third chapter our author goes on to examine the principle of *Roman*

Unity. Ascending from the centre of unity in local churches, viz. the Bishop, he proves the necessity of unity between the Bishops and their respective Churches; the necessity of a central principle upon which this unity of Bishops should depend, round which they should revolve, by which they should be held together, and divorced from which by schism, they cease to be members of the grand Catholic Unity, lose all spiritual vitality, and preserve, at best, nothing but a material succession from the Apostles, "the name that they are living, but are dead." Where, then, is this centre to be found? In the Bishop of Rome. This is why, in every age, tradition has unanimously proclaimed him the chief and head of the Church, the source of its unity, the fountain of episcopal jurisdiction, the Father of fathers, the Shepherd of shepherds, and the Church which he governs the mother and mistress of all Churches. We would emphatically implore our Anglican friends, and especially those who belong to the Unionist school, to read, at least, that portion of this work which, under the title of "*Methodus probandi Ecclesiam Catholicam*," unfolds the mind of Christian antiquity upon this subject. One after another, the learned theologian presents in lucid order the methods employed by S. Irenæus, Tertullian, S. Cyprian, S. Optatus, S. Ambrose, S. Jerome, S. Augustin, the Doctors of the East, and those of the middle ages, to determine the marks or notes which characterize and make manifest to the world the true Church of Christ. He does not string together isolated texts, which, as far as the reader is concerned, may or may not be to the point; but he draws out and makes easy to any apprehension, however little acute, the process of thought and line of reasoning adopted by each Father in turn. His witnesses, writing on such various occasions as they did, and dealing with such various adversaries, differ often in their point of view, or in the prominence which they give to this or that link in the chain of argument; but all are of one mind in bringing out the same result. The final and never-failing criterion of Church membership is communion with the centre of unity. Where the Bishops are united to the Bishop of Rome, there, and nowhere else, is that Christian community of which Christ is the head. It is a delusion to flatter ourselves that we are disciples of Christ, if we are not members of His body; and none are members who are not united by faith, social charity, and obedience, to the centre of life and visible unity, the Vicar of Christ on earth. Such is the method of teaching pursued by the Fathers, and such, therefore, was the universal belief of Christian antiquity.

But whence this belief so firm and constant—and how does it justify itself in the eyes of reason and of faith? Our author enumerates nine leading motives. They are, 1. The historical fact of the foundation of the Roman Church by S. Peter, its first Bishop; 2. his permanent possession of the see till his death; 3. the uninterrupted succession of Popes who have occupied the chair of Peter; 4. the strict and indissoluble connection of these facts with Revelation, from which they attain a certainty above that of history, viz., the infallible certainty of dogmatic facts; 5. the dogmatic facts of the primacy of S. Peter, and of the prerogatives, durable as the Church herself, with which he was invested; 6. the consequent transmission of these prerogatives to his successors without a break; 7. the divine right, in virtue of which Peter lives on in his successors, who inherit his authority, and hand it on

to the end of time; 8. the testimony of history and tradition to the fact of the Bishops of Rome alone being, and being called, the successors of Peter; so that in all times the regular formula for the Roman Church has been the See of Peter, the Chair of Peter; 9. and lastly, the fact, proceeding from the institution of Christ, and uniformly attested by tradition, that the Bishops of the Roman See possess the prerogatives of Peter by divine right, and that, in virtue of the same right, everything is true of them which we believe to be true of S. Peter, as holding the primacy in Christ's Church. "And what is that," concludes F. Schrader, "but that Peter received from Christ authority over all his fellow Apostles precisely for the purpose of maintaining in the Church a perfect unity of mind and heart? This will be ever true, then, of each Pope as he succeeds to Peter's chair, and represents the person of Peter. On him the Church is founded; he holds together the edifice of the Church; he is the active efficient principle, as well of its unity of creed, as of the social communion of each local flock with its own pastor; and therefore he is the centre and chief of the whole Catholic Church."

These conclusions naturally lead to the description which the author gives, in his concluding chapter, of the whole economy of the Christian Church, its hierarchic constitution culminating in a supreme visible head. Which done, the theory of Macarius of Vinnitza, who is the ablest modern exponent of the system of the Greek schismatic church, is subjected to a searching examination, and all his positions refuted from Scripture, carefully illustrated and explained by the comments of the Fathers. The classical passages, viz., in Matt. xvi., Luke xxii., and John xxi., are briefly expounded, as it was not necessary, after Passaglia's great work on the prerogatives of S. Peter, to enter minutely into their exegesis. But the comments of the Fathers, of whatever kind, are brought forward and discussed with great learning and clearness. The Patristic difficulties arising from a comparison of S. Peter with the other Apostles, or specially with S. Paul, and seeming at first sight to imply absolute equality between them, are ably met; and the way is thus left open to the final summary and conclusion, that outside the *Roman Unity* there is no Church truly One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic; that the Roman Church, and the Roman Church alone, comprises in herself all these unmistakable marks of the true Church of Christ, and that she, therefore, is the only way of salvation given to mankind.

All who take interest in the vital questions which, ever since the Eastern schism, divide Christendom, will find in this work much important and well-digested matter. Of those who have the unhappiness not yet to belong to the *Roman Unity*, we would ask two things: first, that they will seriously reflect upon the fact that the question of union with Rome is not one of expedience or advisableness, but simply of life and death; and secondly, that they will take the trouble to study with attention, sincerity, and good faith, the grounds of Roman claims, and then, as in the presence of God, decide for themselves this most momentous question.

Les Pères Apostoliques et leur Epoque. Par M. l'Abbé FREPPEL, Professeur à la Faculté de Théologie de Paris. Deuxième édition. Paris : Bray.

Les Apologistes Chrétiens au Deuxième Siècle : Saint Justin. Par le même. Paris : Bray.

Les Apologistes Chrétiens au Deuxième Siècle. Tatien, Hermias, Athenagore, Théophile d'Antioche, Meliton de Sardes, &c. Par le même. Paris : Bray.

Saint Irénée et l'Eloquence Chrétienne dans le Gaul, pendant les deux premiers Siècles. Par le même. Paris : Bray.

M. FREPPEL is probably best known in this country as the author of one of the smartest of the very numerous criticisms on M. Renan's *Vie de Jésus* that have appeared in France. It has been selected for translation into Italian by the writers of the *Civiltà Cattolica*, who seem to have considered further refutation of the work against which it is directed as superfluous. This is high testimony both to the soundness of M. Freppel's learning, and to the clearness and ease of his style ; and, without making invidious comparisons, we may at least echo the positive praise thus pronounced upon both. We have before us a series of works by the same writer, on which we would very willingly bestow more space than is at present at our disposal. M. Freppel is a professor at the Sorbonne, and the volumes enumerated at the head of this notice contain the substance of his "Cours d'Eloquence Sacrée," during four successive years. The author tells us that they have been printed almost in their original form of lectures, with the addition of a few notes and a correction of some of the defects of thought and expression which almost inevitably creep in when such matters are handled orally and before an audience.

It is certainly a most hopeful sign for the future of ecclesiastical learning in France, that the Sorbonne should possess a professor of such sound learning and remarkable ability as M. Freppel, and that his lectures should have been constantly and numerous attended. A lecturer must consider the tastes and requirements of his audience, and we gather from M. Freppel that he has not had the advantage of speaking merely to a select class of students. It was therefore necessary for him to keep his erudition in the background, and to abstain on many occasions from the discussion of critical questions. The volumes before us are certainly not the less pleasant reading on that account ; but we think that it would be very unfair to charge them with the contrary defect of being too popular and superficial. M. Freppel is a sound scholar and a diligent student, and he has made himself thoroughly familiar with the subject of his lectures, and with the collateral matter that is more or less necessary for their illustration. There are many passages in these lectures in which M. Freppel rises to real eloquence, although it is easy to see that he purposely avoids the fault of being too rhetorical. There are many more in which he argues with admirable force and solidity against some of the legacies of error which have been left behind them by the critics of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. We trust to hear much more of M. Freppel, and to see the French school of Catholic writers to which he

belongs increase both in numbers and activity. The country which, in the person of one of her sons, has offered so gross an insult alike to Christian learning and Catholic feeling as Renan's *Vie de Jésus*, can hardly make a more appropriate reparation to the Church than by giving her a number of learned defenders fit to fight by the side of M. Freppel.

As our space prevents us from entering at any length on the subjects embraced by these volumes, we must content ourselves with noticing a single point with regard to which the courage of M. Freppel will surprise learned men of all countries. In his last-published volume, on S. Irenæus, he gives, by way of introduction to that great father, a rapid sketch of the preaching of the Gospel in Gaul before his time. He thus inevitably comes across the vexed questions that relate to the early apostolate of SS. Lazarus, Martha, and Mary Magdalene in Provence, the seven bishops said to have been sent into Gaul by S. Peter, and the somewhat later mission of S. Denis and his companions. The name of S. Denis recalls a controversy that has long been considered as almost settled. Is the Apostle of Paris the same person with Dionysius the Areopagite, the first bishop of Athens? and are the works commonly known under the name of S. Dionysius genuine or spurious? M. Freppel stoutly maintains the ancient traditionary opinion on all these points; and with many critics he will almost risk his reputation for learning by so doing, or at least he will acquire the character of a man not afraid of any paradox. Of course, not all the points that we have mentioned are beset by equal difficulties. M. Freppel argues very justly indeed, in our opinion, as to the unreasonableness of rejecting the old well-established tradition of any Church with regard to its founders, unless it can be confronted and overbalanced by very certain testimony on the other side. Many writers of Launoy's stamp are inclined to take such traditions as being worth nothing and to throw the burthen of positive proof of the facts thus attested upon the chance assertions or allusions of early writers. This is most unfair. In the case of the tradition which connects the family of Bethany with the earliest introduction of Christianity into Provence, that tradition is too certainly ancient, and is supported by too many monuments of different kinds, to be fairly considered doubtful. The recent labours of M. Faillon have done much to clear up this question. If we pass on to that which concerns the mission of seven bishops by S. Peter, the tradition appears to be opposed to the inference naturally to be drawn from a passage of Sulpicius Severus about the date of the first persecution in Gaul, and to a direct statement of Gregory of Tours, who places the arrival of S. Denis and some companions in the reign of the emperor Decius. Both these difficulties, however, appear to admit of easy solution; and it can hardly be doubted that Gregory of Tours mistook the statement of his authorities. According to the tradition, however, S. Denis and his companions were sent not by S. Peter, but by S. Clement, after the death of the Apostle. With regard to the date of the arrival of S. Denis, M. Freppel brings a sufficiently strong phalanx of witnesses for the ancient tradition. Then comes the question, was S. Denis the same man with S. Dionysius the Areopagite? The negative arguments and difficulties are strong against the traditional opinion; but they are not strong enough to stand against any positive authority on the other side. The solu-

tion of the question depends on the industry, learning, and resources of Hilduin, the Abbot of S. Denis, who, in the ninth century, drew up the Acts of the Patron Saint of his monastery, at the request of Louis le Débonnaire. Hilduin asserts positively the identity of the Apostle of Paris with the Bishop of Athens. If he was misled, as is asserted, by some fictitious acts attributed to Aristarchus, or if he jumped to the conclusion that the Dionysius mentioned by S. Luke must be the S. Denis whose memory he was concerned in celebrating, we cannot be expected to attribute any weight to his testimony. Hincmar, however, affirms that he had seen some ancient acts in which the identity was mentioned : and his authority made Mabillon hesitate to reject the tradition, which is also supported by the monuments and writers of the Greek Church, as well as by the Roman martyrology. On the other hand, there is the obvious argument that identity of name might easily be taken to imply identity of person.

However, M. Freppel perseveres in his enterprise, and not only "rehabilitates" S. Denis as to his identity with the Areopagite, but endeavours further to establish the genuineness of the works known under the name of the latter. Hitherto each successive step in this process of restoration has required the certainty of the step immediately preceding it as its own starting-point. If S. Denis did not come into France till long after the time of S. Clement or S. Peter, he could not have been the person converted by S. Paul at Athens. With regard to the works, however, we are on different ground : their genuineness has nothing to do with the question as to the preaching of S. Dionysius in France. M. Freppel assails, and, it must be allowed, with some success, the external arguments against the genuineness of these most remarkable books ; and, were these arguments without other confirmation, he might fairly be said to have made out a case against the destructive critics. But it is clear that these works have been very generally attributed to a later age by learned men of modern times, chiefly on internal grounds. There are many features in them that seem to make it very difficult indeed to assign to them a date much earlier than that of their first production in controversy by the Severian heretics. There is, perhaps, scarcely one of these features that might not be explained in some way or other, if all the rest of the internal evidence inclined in favour of the earlier date. But it is not so ; and the concurrence of so many arguments against him is, we are afraid, too much for M. Freppel's powers of reasoning. He has made a gallant effort, but he has hardly done more than reopen a question which was considered as already settled : a question which is, as he himself observes, of purely scientific interest.

Histoire d'Urbain V. et de son Siècle, d'après les manuscrits du Vatican. Par l'Abbé MAGNAN, Supérieur du Petit Séminaire de Marseille. Deuxième édition. Paris : Bray.

THE Abbé Magnan is fortunate in his subject. Of the seven Provençal Pontiffs, Urban V. was the one from whom the Florentine chroniclers, the brothers Villani, must have found it hardest, with all their Ghibelline hate and Italian jealousy, to withhold their admiration. M. Magnan does

not disguise a strong bias in the opposite direction. Even the outward pretence of judicial phlegm is conspicuously absent from the Introduction, in which we are prepared for a just appreciation of Urban's position by a rapid outline of his epoch. His epoch is that painfully interesting episode in the annals of the Holy See branded by Petrarch, in the bitterness of his Tuscan soul, as the captivity of Babylon. In our Frenchman, on the other hand, this French dynasty naturally finds an apologist as well as an historian.

William de Grimoard, who, as Urban V., was destined to lead back the Papal court from its exile in beautiful Provence, was born not many leagues to the northward, in the very year in which that exile was formally inaugurated by Clement V. Eminent abilities, brought fairly into play by the advantages of birth, exercised through the training of youth and early manhood with unrelenting industry and perseverance, and all consecrated by nobleness of aim and a masculine but amiable virtue, conducted him with brilliant success through the various offices open in that day to a Benedictine monk, holy, learned, and eloquent; until at length, in his fifty-fourth year, while Abbot of St. Victor at Marseilles, not yet Cardinal or Bishop, he was chosen to succeed Pope Innocent VI. As we read through the twenty chapters crowded with the records of the Pontificate which followed this unusual selection, we run the risk, unless we watch the dates pretty closely, of imagining that the transactions of some score of years are passing in review before us, and that the reign of this two-hundredth Pope must have almost equalled in length the reign of the first Pope, Peter. Yet Urban V., born in 1308 and crowned with the tiara in 1362, was in 1370 laid to rest in the vaults at St. Victor's. During those eight brief years no useful scheme for the glory of God and the good of man was too stupendous or too trifling for the keen-sighted wisdom, the mild determination, the tranquil, ubiquitous energy of one who at each moment heard the Good Shepherd urging upon him anew the tender mandate, "Feed My lambs, feed My sheep." He stemmed the torrent of licentiousness which the reaction after the Black Plague of 1348, immortalized in a book too sure, alas! of its own immortality, would seem to have carried beyond the terrible average of human corruption. He exorcised many deplorable abuses which had crept or had thrust themselves into the vestibule of God's temple, nay into the sanctuary itself. He fearlessly shielded the poor, and friendless, and feeble against the oppression of grasping usurers and haughty barons. He exalted the standard of European intellect by the homage he paid to the representatives of genius and learning, and by his munificence in founding colleges at Cracow and Montpellier, and further north and further south. Out of his royal liberality he maintained a thousand—some say fourteen hundred—students of divinity and medicine, not in his own country only. One trait of his fatherly thoughtfulness deserves special mention. To spare the blushes and the purses of the poorer scholars, the Pope issued sumptuary laws for the universities, which, by prescribing a more uniform sobriety of living and apparel, put an end to many mortifying distinctions between the needy and the rich.

But the cloister and the lecture-hall, the huts and palaces of Europe, did not monopolize the solicitude of the liege Lord of Christendom. He alone it was whose ear, through the baying of hounds and the yelling of jackals close

at hand, caught the roar of the lion in the distance. He alone it was whose political ken stretched beyond the unchristian quarrels of Christian princes to the perils which from the East threatened, not a part, but the whole of Christendom, and, with it, the civilization of the human race. The empire of the Greeks, the fickle, perfidious, and ungrateful Greeks, was necessarily the first to meet the shock of the Moslem onslaught. This rampart was weak because sundered from the centre of the social fabric. Urban went further than almost any other in his zeal to bridge over the chasm between the East and the West, receiving at Rome, in 1369, the abjuration of the Emperor John Palæologus, and, soon after, that of the Patriarch of the Nestorians, each followed by whole nations in this return to Catholic unity. Not content with defensive measures, Urban also strove to organize a new Crusade against the Ottoman power, which, besides higher benefits, might furnish a desirable vent for the rude military virtues of such men as John Hawkswood and his troublesome Company of Free Lances. But the Church militant was no longer blessed with a S. Louis.

The historian of Pope Urban has lain under the delightful necessity of strewing his pages thickly with other names besides, which can never cease to provoke our interest: names of poets, and names which have furnished many a poet with his inspirations—names chosen often “to point a moral and adorn a tale,” and in their latter capacity so intensely romantic of themselves as to force even Fiction to be content with the truth, and dispense for the nonce with her inventive devices. We pass over the strange career of Cola di Rienzi, with its “impotent and lame conclusion.” Egidio Albornoz is a truer hero. There is a spell about greatness, even when divorced from virtue: but it is a purer and healthier delight when the heart is able to esteem and love what the mind admires. Almost the foremost captain of a martial age, strong in battle and far-sighted in council—solidly triumphant in his contest with the tyrant of Milan, and in all the complicated Italian wars, though hampered throughout with utterly inadequate instruments—politician, governor, legislator on the broadest and most statesmanlike scale—he was on the whole a rare union of the splendid and the good, and no unworthy countryman of the great Ximenes. Modern fastidiousness may be shocked when we add that he, too, was a Cardinal, preceding by a hundred years the great founder of Alcala in the archbishopric of Toledo. Yet characters so incongruous were in Albornoz wedded in marvellous harmony. A hostile authority of note,* having confessed somewhat ungraciously that “Urban V. excelled in all the better qualities of a Benedictine monk,” confesses likewise that “his warlike legate, though highly expert in deeds of arms, never forgot his pontifical decency.”

Another Cardinal created in this reign was Simon Langham, Archbishop of Canterbury. When Dr. Longley on a late occasion sat in judgment on certain disputed doctrines, as a member of her Majesty's Privy Council, he was hardly, perhaps, aware that among the errors condemned by Cardinal Langham, in certain persons connected with the university of Oxford, in 1367, was a proposition denying the eternity of the pains of hell. Another

* Milman's “*Latin Christianity*,” v. pp. 382, 387.

contemporary of Urban was the celebrated Joanna, Queen of Naples. She was the first queen to receive the Golden Rose presented by the Pope on *Lætare* or Mid-Lent Sunday to some royal benefactor of the Church. In her favour Urban abrogated the Salic law, which had reserved this distinction for kings. The Empress of the French and the Queen of Spain, who have recently profited by the precedent thus established, are hardly aware that they owe the honour in some sort to this remote ancestor of Pio Nono.

After all, the prime glory of the fifth Urban is this, that he satisfied the instinctive yearnings of the Church's heart and of his own by leaving Avignon and seeking once more the shadow of the Seven Hills. Yet, in spite of the warnings of S. Bridget of Sweden, he returned to die;—the last Pope who died at Avignon, and the last but one who lived there. He died a saint's death, as he had lived a saint's life. In his elevation he used the simple fare and wore the simple dress of a poor religious. Never, amidst all his engrossing labours and his perilous and fatiguing journeys, did he omit the celebration of the Holy Sacrifice. Prayer was his daily bread, and he was no niggard to his own soul. Calumny was at fault: she could fling no insult at him that even enemies dared to applaud. No wonder that, as soon as his pure spirit had flown to its reward, his weeping flock struggled for fragments of his robe as for priceless relics. With love and reverence, they bore the placid corpse upon their shoulders, three days' journey, to its final resting-place; and many miracles attested the sublime heights to which the servant of God had climbed. His image, with the aureole of sainthood encircling the forehead, was, as Benedict XIV. mentions, eagerly multiplied to gratify the filial devotion of the faithful. And though his canonization, for which the kings of Denmark, France, and Sicily petitioned, could not be accomplished in those troubled times, a public office was chanted in his honour in several monasteries of Languedoc till the time of the first French Republic. It will not be the Abbé Magnan's fault if the readers of this new *Life* be not sorely tempted to cry, in the silence of their hearts, "O blessed Urban, pray for us!"

Vie et Vertus de l'Humble Servante de Dieu, la Vénérable Anna-Maria Taïgi.

Par Mgr. LUQUET, Évêque d'Hésébon. Deuxième édition. Paris: Putois-Cretté. 1863.

THIS little work purposes to be nothing more than an "abridged account" of the wonderful life of Anna Maria Taïgi, whom the Holy See has declared to be Venerable, and for whom the faithful hopefully anticipate further honours. Ample materials exist for a more enlarged biography. The opinion entertained of her sanctity by persons in high ecclesiastical position has led to the authentic collection of the best-attested facts. The Cardinal Vicar enjoined the priest who had directed this holy woman for twenty years, to collect privately all documents relating to her life: thus testimony has been placed on record which the death of the witnesses would hereafter have rendered unattainable; a circumstance which will greatly facilitate the necessary processes, should it enter into the designs of God that Anna Maria Taïgi should be one day canonized. The Cardinal Pedicini,

Vice-Chancellor of the Roman Church, and Prefect of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, had known and revered the venerable servant of God for thirty years, and on the occasion of her death, in 1837, wrote a letter to the Cardinal-Vicar, conveying the solemn tribute of his admiration for the extraordinary gifts with which God had enriched her, and the wonderful light she had received respecting the future events of the Church and of the world. He, moreover, before his own death, left a private deposition, in the form of a rescript, accompanied with all those formalities which will give it force of law, and invest it with all the weight which the privileges of his own ecclesiastical dignity and office conferred upon him.

Many other prelates, and even Popes, entertained the highest opinion of the sanctity of Anna Maria during her lifetime. The venerable Mgr. Strambi, who enjoyed the confidence of Leo XII., and was daily consulted by that pontiff concerning his plans of reform, habitually asked the advice of this humble woman, and was always filled with admiration at the wisdom of her counsels. Other eminent priests and laymen have left their testimony to her exalted merits; and Marie-Louise de Bourbon, Duchess of Lucca and Queen of Etruria, loved her as a friend and a mother. This princess had but one fault to find with Anna Maria: she would neither ask for nor accept anything. "Prendi, prendi, Nanna mia, quel che vuoi"—("Take, take, my Nanny, what you will"), she would say, opening a chest of gold before the poor toil-worn sufferer; and Anna Maria would smile, and answer, with a like simplicity, "Ma quanto siete pazzarella!"—"But what a silly little thing you are!" [It is impossible, in our matter-of-fact English, to convey the sense of the Italian, without an offensive rudeness from which that more graceful tongue is free in its affectionate freedoms and familiarities.] "I serve a Lord who is much richer than you are." Anna Maria and her family barely subsisted by the labour of their hands, yet she would never profit by the good-will of her rich and powerful friends to relieve her poverty, or advance the fortune of her children. Like most who have been drawn to the higher paths of holiness, she passed through progressive stages. After the temporary alienation from God through the passion for gaiety and pleasure which filled her young and ardent heart, but which never appears to have led her into any gross infraction of the moral law, although it became the subject of a life-long penitence, she generously devoted herself to the service of God. She was already married to a Milanese of the name of Domenico Taigi, who occupied an humble grade of service in the house of Chigi. Her own name was Gesualda. Her family had belonged to the respectable middle class at Siena, but had been reduced to ruin through the fault of Anna Maria's father, which was the cause of their removal to Rome. The young girl, who sought in marriage a protection from the temptations which surrounded her, humbly acquiesced in the inferior social position to which she had descended, and resolved to consider personal merit and good character alone in her future partner. The husband God gave her seems to have been a good man in the main; but to his rusticity and deficiency in refinement, he appears to have added an exacting and troublesome temper. She was a model, both as a wife and as a mother; but it pleased God to veil, in a most extraordinary manner, from the eyes of both husband and children, and

specially the former, the supernatural favours with which He inundated her soul, even to overflowing. The song of a bird, the sight of a flower—a very nothing—seemed sufficient to throw her into a divine rapture. To avoid notice, she would wander away to other churches, in order to communicate ; but Jesus reproached her with this human timidity, and bade her disregard the tongues of men. Many, indeed, were the persecutions which her fervent transports brought upon her, not from neighbours only, but from priests themselves, whom God permitted, for the exercise of her patience, to mistake her for a hypocrite.

The day of trials, outward and inward, followed (as is usual) that of sensible graces, and amongst the many virtues which were perfected in the furnace of affliction, an heroic tranquillity of soul shines most conspicuous in this holy woman. It was a grace of which our Lord chose her to offer a special example amidst the cares of a secular life, and what are esteemed the grinding anxieties of poverty, and of which He revealed to her the singular value. The gifts of healing and the spirit of prophecy seem to have been given to her in abundant measure, and she possessed that painful privilege which has occasionally been accorded to the saints, of perceiving sin by the sense of smell. Her biographer considers a certain reserve incumbent upon him when speaking of one upon whose sanctity the Church has not yet pronounced ; but we gather from what he permits himself to say, that she had the supernatural gift of seeing, as it were, whatever she made the direct subject of contemplation : in virtue of which illumination, she had the most surprising insight into the realms of nature and grace, as well as the departments of sacred and profane history. Her predictions with reference to the present Holy Father long before his exaltation to the See of Peter, and which rest on the most irrefragable testimony, have been fulfilled to the letter. We hail this partial accomplishment as the hopeful pledge of the realization of yet further promises in store, which point to the confusion, during his Pontificate, of the enemies of the Church, and so signal a triumph of the Faith that the nations shall be stupefied with very amazement.

Alexandri Neckam de Naturis Rerum libri duo. With the Poem of the same Author, *De Laudibus Divinæ Sapientie*. Edited by THOMAS WRIGHT, Esq., M.A., F.S.A., &c., Corresponding Member of the Imperial Institute of France. London : Longman. 1863.

THIS is one of the publications issued under the direction of the Master of the Rolls, and which, by a large interpretation, has found entrance into the catalogue of the "Chronicles and Memorials of Great Britain and Ireland during the Middle Ages." Although on the surface the Master of the Rolls may seem to be required to confine himself to historical documents, he is really not so restricted ; for, as it is his purpose to illustrate the mediæval history of England, hardly any unpublished work ought to be excluded from his list. Very often a particular chronicle may add nothing to our knowledge, while letters and sermons, and theological tracts may throw no little light upon the times. Thus the publication of Grossteste's letters by Mr.

Luard has been of greater service than many of the professed histories ; for it has brought out the bishop in a new aspect, and opened the way to a better appreciation of Matthew Paris and his continuators. A like service has been rendered by Mr. Babington, who, by publishing a work of Reginald Pecock, revealed a phase of English controversy hitherto unnoticed, and, while clearing Pecock's memory of one accusation, branded it for ever with another, hitherto unnoticed, and perhaps unsuspected.

The work of Neckam, edited by Mr. Wright, is a treatise of natural history moralized, and is a valuable contribution to our knowledge of the men who lived in the beginning of the thirteenth century. Mr. Wright will have it that the book "was intended to be a manual of the scientific knowledge of the time ;" but it is not easy to grant his proposition. Neckam does not appear to have had that view of his work ; and it might be maintained, we think, with greater reason, that he compiled his book more for spiritual than for scientific purposes, and that his knowledge of natural things is not to be measured by the contents of his book, which is really a theological commentary upon the visible creation. In the days of Neckam that was a common way of writing, but it does not please a later generation. People are wearied by moral and spiritual reflections, and therefore avoid the books that contain them, or the men who utter them. Neckam, after observing that the sound of bells is clearer by the water-side, adds that the best preaching is that which is by the waters of grace. The natural phenomenon and the spiritual reflection are both true ; but, somehow or other, people who would listen with pleasure to the bells, would feel annoyed if they were reminded of the spiritual truth which Alexander Neckam evolved out of their music.

In our day this method of writing is called fanciful, and Neckam would probably have called our methods dry ; for tastes vary. Neckam's object was not science, but devotion ; and the facts of natural history are with him but the points of his meditation, or the texts of his sermon. "I, in my littleness," he says in the preface, "have resolved to describe certain natural phenomena, in order that the reader, considering their properties, may ascend to their source, namely, to the Maker of all things." If we read Neckam's book as he intended it to be read, and not as Mr. Wright reads it, as "a manual of the scientific knowledge of the time," we shall really read a very good, and even entertaining book ; for it is the work of a thoughtful, meditative man, whose heart was not in this world. He begins by comparing the first chapter of Genesis with the opening of S. John's Gospel, and on the words "The earth was void and empty," it might be supposed that he anticipated the Franciscan doctrine of the Incarnation, which Scotus developed, and against which the strong school of the Dominicans has taxed its ingenuity to the utmost. "Terra erat inanis, quia nondum Deitas habitavit in nobis, hoc est, in natura nostra, Ei unita." That is, creation was incomplete, because He for whom it was prepared had not come. It is possible that Alexander Neckam may not have held the doctrine implied by his words, because even prophets do not always understand what they say ; nevertheless, the second chapter, from which we have quoted, is an eloquent commentary, which the Franciscan will read with pleasure.

Neckam was born in the middle of the twelfth century, in the depths of the "dark ages," when, it is said, men were rude and women ignorant. But there is no trace of this rudeness, nor evidence of this ignorance: men and women were then what they are now, with very slight differences. Neckam complains of the men that they were luxurious in their habits: the dandies of his day, like ours, *videri feminae student*; and, on the other hand, the women trenched on the habits of men:—*non solum habitu vestium, sed et tonsura videri volunt esse mares*. The hats and cloaks worn in our day may have been worn by the young ladies who lived in the reign of Richard I.

Cooking also was an art in those days, and a very serious one. Giraldus Cambrensis tells a story of the monks of S. Swithin's at Winchester, that they complained to the King of their Bishop, who was also their Abbot, because he had reduced their dinner by three dishes. The monks were inconsolable, because they had only ten left them. We find, too, from Neckam, that hard eating was not an unusual thing in those days: those who could afford it had their game dressed in their presence, because they delighted in the odours of that cookery. They changed their drinking-cups according to the nature of the liquor—gold vessels, and then glass; and for some kind of drinking the proper cups were of Samian pottery. Neckam reflects upon this, and says that one man eats alone what would satisfy many poor. The same morality has been repeated ever since; and it was but the other day that a sarcastic friend of ours said to his neighbour—interested, like himself, in an orphanage,—after a feast, "Well, I think we have eaten ten orphans!"

Mr. Wright has very laboriously verified the quotations from profane books made by Neckam, but has left unnoticed the references to Holy Scripture, not even distinguishing them from the text by inverted commas. Want of sympathy with the author is a sore drawback in an editor; and Mr. Wright has none with Neckam, none with his peculiar learning, none with his moralities, which to him seem "far-fetched." Neither has he taken sufficient pains to ascertain his history, as appears from the following passage of the Preface:—"According to an anecdote given on the authority of Boston of Bury, a bibliographical writer of the beginning of the fifteenth century, Neckam abandoned his school at Dunstable, because he had formed a desire of entering one of the monastic orders, and he first turned his eyes to the great Benedictine establishment in his native town of S. Alban's. He accordingly addressed an application to the Abbot in the terms, '*Si vis, veniam; sin autem, &c.*' to which the Abbot, who appears to have been somewhat of a wit, replied, '*Si bonus es, venias; si nequam, nequaquam.*' We are told that Neckam took so much offence at this joke upon his name, that he abandoned the Benedictines, and became one of the Augustinian monks of Ciren-
cester."

If this story be true, Neckam could not have been in good dispositions for a life of obedience and self-abnegation, when he demanded the Benedictine habit of the Abbot of S. Alban's. Mr. Wright would have done better if he had consulted the Lives of those abbots before admitting the story of Boston of Bury. In the Life of Garinus, the twentieth Abbot of S. Alban's, the story is told differently: for in a note to that Life, in which it is said that

Neckam had been master of the school at S. Alban's—a fact unrecorded by Mr. Wright—it is related that Neckam applied to the Abbot for the mastership, and that the Abbot wrote to him : “Si bonus es, venias ; si nequam, nequaquam.” Neckam answered, breviter et jocose, “Si velis, veniam ; sin autem, tu autem.” And the writer adds this commentary : “Ac si diceret, ‘Non multum curo.’” Neckam apparently was not offended, for he became schoolmaster of S. Alban's ; unless it be that he had resigned his appointment, and was at this time making a second application for the place. The story, as told by the writer of the note, is much more credible than that given by Boston and adopted by Mr. Wright ; and it is a very different thing to apply for the habit of a monk and for the place of a schoolmaster.

History of the Holy Cross. Reproduced in fac-simile from the original edition printed by J. VELDENER in 1483. Text and Engravings by J. P. Berjeau. London : Stewart. 1863.

THIS is a very curious book in a religious no less than in an antiquarian point of view. It has been printed from the original in Lord Spencer's library ; the only two other remaining copies known to exist being one in the Royal Library at Brussels, and another in Mr. Schinkel's collection at the Hague. The legend of the History of the Cross came down to the Middle Ages from very early times. The present version, put into rhyme by some unknown Dutch author, was probably, in the opinion of M. Berjeau, the translation of an older Latin one affixed to the original block book of the *Historia Crucis*, which Veldener sawed in pieces, in order to use the woodcuts separately in a quarto volume. From the breakages, which are easily discernible, it appears that the Latin book consisted of eleven pages, with six woodcuts each, all printed on one side of the paper, four being on the titlepage, with a title or short introduction.

Veldener used the block book of the *Speculum Humane Salvationis*, which he published the same year, in a similar manner. Of the two Latin editions of the *Speculum* now existing—there are others in Flemish—that which contains twenty leaves, executed in the immovable or xylographic type, must have been the oldest. The specimen in the British Museum from which the modern edition has been reprinted by M. Berjeau belongs to the latter class. It clearly indicates the infancy of the art, and is supposed to have been executed by Laurent Costen, and to have been the earliest book printed in the movable types, a discovery without which that of Guttemberg would have had a very limited value. It is, however, as is well known, a disputed point amongst the learned, to which of the two the merit of the invention of the movable types is to be referred.

Veldener was a native of Wurtzburg ; but as he never printed in his own country, he has commonly been supposed to be a Dutchman. He printed or perhaps only supplied the types, for several of the books ascribed to Carxon. It seems probable that he purchased or otherwise procured the blocks of the original block book of the *History of the Cross*, as he had previously obtained those of the *Speculum* ; but both appear to belong to a much earlier date,

as their extreme quaintness would indeed serve to show ; and may, perhaps, it is suggested, " be traced back to the Brothers of Common Life,—the *Speculum* to the Dutch, and the *History of the Cross* to the German communities."

Some very ancient paintings in fresco were discovered in the year 1804 on the walls of the chapel of the Trinity at Stratford-upon-Avon (erected towards the latter end of the reign of Henry VII.), representing passages from the legend of the Holy Cross. The existence of a confraternity or guild of the Holy Cross at that place had already been noticed by Dugdale. These paintings, the earliest specimen of the art of which we possess any remains in England, are much defaced. The first represents the Queen of Saba visiting Solomon ; a part is obliterated, but the extremity of the wood of the Cross is still discernible. King Solomon, as we learn from the legend, had employed the wood destined, since the earliest days of the world, to be the tree from which Christ should reign, as a bridge, and the queen at once reproached him for his irreverence, and evinced her own piety, by passing through the stream barefoot. All the other paintings are equally injured, some more ; they relate to the finding of the Cross by the Empress Helen, Heraclius's battle with the Persians, and the restoration to Jerusalem of the Sacred Wood.

The evident close relation of the History of the Cross with the secret societies of the Middle Ages, and, particularly, the early Rosicrucians, is a curious feature belonging to it. The connection will at once be recognized in the plates by any one acquainted with the emblematic language of Freemasonry.

The Dutch text of the "History of the Cross," of which English and French versions are subjoined, was, M. Berjeau considers, evidently borrowed partly from Rufinus's Ecclesiastical History and the *Golden Legend* of Jacobus de Voragine, partly from some early MSS. of the thirteenth century which M. Berjeau found in the British Museum. The legend of the three seeds given by an angel to Seth, and buried by him in Adam's grave, are given both in the *Golden Legend* and in one of the MSS. just mentioned, which develops in a poetical way what the former only hints. The interval between Adam and Solomon, wanting in the *Golden Legend*, is filled up in one of these MSS. which relates how Moses and David found the tree of the Cross. No doubt the Dutch author drew his materials from these or other versions of similar origin. As to the question, how much, or if any, authority is to be assigned to that portion of the Legend of the Cross which refers to the times preceeding our Lord, it would be vain to attempt to decide or even to institute inquiry. Yet it might appear rash to treat it collectively as the mere fabrication of the popular religious mind working upon the subject. Any how, they furnish us with an interesting memorial of the form which devotion to the Cross assumed in early times, and of the simple objective character of that which nourished the piety and accorded with the devotional instincts of those days. As they were days of simple piety, they were days also of the uncritical, but not therefore always, or even generally, erroneous chronicling of facts : whatever was told to the historian by credible witnesses was placed on record. So also as respects those very early legends appended to the historical narrative of the finding of the Cross, as well as many of its accessories,

all we would contend for is, that it would be as absurd to suppose them to be *invented* by their early promulgators as to lay a like charge to the most credulous of the ancient chroniclers of secular history. Such being the case, the interest which attaches to them is not simply antiquarian, but, as we have said, religious also; not only as exhibiting the mould in which piety flowed in the Middle Ages, but on account of the portions of truth which may really be embodied in the traditions of which they are the remnants and exponents.

The Complete Works of S. John of the Cross. Translated from the original Spanish by DAVID LEWIS, Esq., M.A.; edited by the Oblate Fathers of S. Charles: with a Preface by His Eminence Cardinal WISEMAN. Vol. I. London: Longman.

AN early copy of this volume has been forwarded to us for notice, though we believe that, owing to some accidental delay, it will probably not appear till towards the close of the month.

It is very interesting to observe the number of considerable persons who will have had a hand in its completion. The original suggestion of having S. John's works translated came from F. Faber, who intended to have published them himself. The translator named by F. Faber, who has now completed his labours, is Mr. David Lewis: and we have Cardinal Wiseman's emphatic testimony to the truly admirable way in which the task has been performed. The Oblate Fathers have undertaken the responsibility of its publication, and "have enriched it with marginal notes and a double index." Last, but not least, the Cardinal Archbishop has shown his paternal interest in the work by contributing a most valuable preface.

We hail with peculiar pleasure the first instalment of this undertaking, and trust not merely that the other volumes will speedily follow (of which we suppose there is little doubt), but that the whole will be but the first of a continued series. We fully hope that we shall be able in an early number to present our readers with a comment on the Saint's works, which shall not be wholly unworthy of the subject. Among the many great writers who have treated of mystical theology, S. John of the Cross, by common consent, ranks as the first.

The Cardinal's preface occupies a ground which the present state of public opinion renders peculiarly important, and (we may say) necessary. Protestants regard with supremest derision and contempt the whole notion of a mystical and contemplative life; nor is it probable that we English Catholics should mix as intimately as we do with Protestants, without unconsciously imbibing some part of their anti-supernatural spirit. The Cardinal meets Protestants on their own ground, after a masterly and unanswerable fashion. Protestants, he argues, fully admit the excellence and advantage of contemplating poetical, mathematical, moral truths. But God "and his Attributes present more perfect claims, motives, and allurements, and more full gratifications, repletion, and reward to earnest and affectionate contemplation than any other object or subject. How much soever the mathematician may strain his intellect in pursuit of the true; however the poet may luxuriate in the enjoy-

ment of the beautiful ; to whatsoever extent the moralist may delight in the apprehension of the good in its recondite quintessence ; none of these can reach, in his special aim and longing, that elevation and consummation which can be attained in those of all the three by one whose contemplation is directed to the Infinite in Truth, in Beauty, and in Goodness. Why, then, should not this, so comprehensive and so grand a source of every mental enjoyment, become a supreme, all-exhausting, and sole object of contemplative fruition ?" (p. xvii.)

The ordinary Protestant contempt for Mystical Theology is, in fact, only one peculiarly outrageous instance of a general law. "We know," says Mr. Stuart Mill, "how easily the uselessness of almost every branch of knowledge may be proved, to the complete satisfaction of those who do not possess it. How many, not altogether stupid, men think the scientific study of languages useless, think ancient literature useless, all erudition useless, logic and metaphysics useless, poetry and the fine arts idle and frivolous. Even history has been pronounced useless and mischievous by able men." A man who does not possess historical, or poetical, or philosophical cultivation, is tempted by pride to disparage that in which he does not excel ; and so all of us, we may depend on it, who have no vocation to the high contemplative life are tempted by pride to disparage Mystical Theology. Undoubtedly we are not called on merely as Catholics, unless we have a special vocation, to practise its lessons ; but we *are* called upon merely as Catholics to believe and profess that those who have this vocation, and who follow faithfully the special grace thus given them, are far higher and more blessed than we are if we have it not.

Five Lectures on the Character of S. Paul. By the Rev. J. S. Howson, D.D. (Hulsean Lectures for 1862.) London : Longman. 1864.

DR. HOWSON is already very widely and favourably known from his part in the authorship of "The Life and Epistles of S. Paul ;" a work of great value to the student of the New Testament, both from its intrinsic merits, and also from the absence of any other book of the same kind on the subject of which it treats. Still, the reader of the two handsome volumes to which we refer will hardly expect from Dr. Howson anything very deep or new on the character of S. Paul. The chief merit of that work lay in the careful collection and comparison of historical, geographical, and antiquarian details illustrative of the career of the great Apostle. We never knew so much before of the countries in which he preached, the roads along which he travelled, the local scenery and political condition of the towns in which his Churches were founded. Information of this kind is always interesting, and often very illustrative of the minute accuracy of the narrative of S. Luke. It was delightful to many of Dr. Howson's readers to understand that when S. Paul landed at Perga, in Pamphylia, it was the time for the summer *villegiatura*, when the inhabitants of the sea-coast had betaken themselves to the mountains for refreshment and recreation, and that therefore the apostle with his companions went straight on to

Antioch, in Pisidia. So again, much of the description of the central parts of Asia Minor, over which the great roads lay, or of the nautical conditions of the voyage from Troas to Samothrace and Neapolis, enabled the reader to draw for himself a more complete picture than was before possible of the incidents related by S. Luke: nor, while we are mentioning such matters, can we omit to specify particularly the very interesting account of S. Paul's last recorded voyage and shipwreck, and the accurate identification of the place of landing described in the Acts with the traditional site at Malta.

We do not mean to deny other or even higher merits to some parts of Dr. Howson's former work, but, on the whole, those we have named deserve the chief notice. Such a work, however, might obviously have been written by an industrious collector of the results of modern discoveries, who might not necessarily have been endowed with the capacity for thoroughly appreciating the character of S. Paul. The labours that are required for the production of such a book do not necessarily imply the power of understanding the state of things in which the apostle moved, still less that of penetrating beneath the exterior of his actions and life, and seizing the more peculiar and essential features of his individual character. Dr. Howson was a very good *cicerone*, and, unlike many of his class, he had the good sense not to obtrude his own views and interpretations of the scenes to which he introduced his readers.

Such a writer exposes himself to a new and severe trial when he undertakes to deal with the personal character of S. Paul. In the introduction to his first Lecture Dr. Howson tells us that he was mainly led to the selection of his subject by the fact that it was already familiar to him. His past studies have made him, of course, well acquainted with all the recorded details of the apostle's career. He has thrown together those which seem to him to illustrate particularly the various qualities of which he thinks the character of S. Paul to have been composed. The first lecture is devoted to instances of "tact and presence of mind;" then follow "tenderness and sympathy; conscientiousness and integrity; thanksgiving and prayer; courage and perseverance." In many cases the subject is worked out in a very interesting manner, but we can hardly consider the whole work as more than a rather hasty sketch. We miss many features which, although the fruit of divine grace and of intimate union with God, and close imitation of our Lord, have still as much right to be called essential parts of the character of S. Paul, as he is presented to us in the New Testament, as those that have been enumerated by Dr. Howson. Such are the profound humility and religiousness of the apostle; such also is his burning personal devotion to our Lord, as if he had been one of His favoured companions while on earth, like S. Peter or S. John. Dr. Howson might have dwelt, also, on the methods of thought habitual to S. Paul, as he has, with much truth, on his favourite images; and he might have said something of what we may call the favourite contemplations of an apostle who has thrown off so many grand outlines of the providence of God towards the heathen, the restoration of all things in heaven and in earth, the whole creation groaning and travailing together for the manifestation of the sons of God, or the economy of redemption as viewed by the angels. We have little

fault to find with Dr. Howson as far as he goes, but he might have gone further with the character of S. Paul for a subject. We must notice, also, another feature of his work which must make it less attractive to the general reader than to the particular audience to which these lectures were addressed. They have been shaped in several instances to suit the exigencies of time and place; such as the meeting of the British Association at Cambridge, at the time of the opening lecture, and the fact that the third was delivered at the commencement of the full term, and therefore to an audience containing many students just arrived for the first time at the university. No doubt S. Paul was very honest as to money matters, but his integrity in this respect would hardly have been brought forward with such special prominence if the preacher had not wished to warn inexperienced "freshmen" against the temptation of running into debt.

We ought not to dismiss Dr. Howson's volume without mentioning that it is enriched with a great many very interesting notes, in which passages from various authors are brought to bear on the statements in the text. Dr. Howson leans, perhaps, somewhat too much on Monod and Pressensé. He has also, especially in the lecture on "Tenderness and Sympathy," used some of the beautiful and suggestive passages about S. Paul that are to be found in different publications of Dr. Newman; quotations from whose writings, we may add, are pretty sure to be found in any work of the more thoughtful Anglicans of our time. We notice Dr. Howson's use of Dr. Newman's Sermons for two reasons. In the first place, few living writers have probably more thoroughly understood the character of S. Paul, or thrown more incidental flashes of light upon it than Dr. Newman. In the second place, we are sorry to see that Dr. Howson cannot quote him or use him without putting in an attack by way of protest. It would be quite worth while to collect some day all the unfair things that have been said of Dr. Newman by Anglican writers, who are obliged to admire his genius, and to acknowledge their obligations to him,—the most unfair often coming from those who owe him the most. Such a collection might possibly illustrate, better than Dr. Howson imagines, the attitude maintained by "his Jewish brethren" towards the Apostle of the Gentiles. It is with reference to this subject, of S. Paul and the Jews, that Dr. Howson has opened fire. Dr. Newman has remarked on the great love with which S. Paul always regarded the Jews. "Yes," says Dr. Howson (p. 124), "but it was surely hardly in harmony with the apostle's spirit that this eminent writer on a recent occasion spoke of 'shuddering' when he recollected his old position in the English Church, and 'shivering' at the thought of Anglican worship." Very tart, but very unjust. No one ever dreams of denying that the greatest tenderness for individuals is perfectly consistent with the greatest abhorrence of the false system that may enchain them. Besides, if we remember right, the letter in question was written by Dr. Newman to vindicate himself from one of the many calumnies that have been circulated concerning him: that is, that he was about to return to the Anglican communion. He said he "shuddered" at the thought of the *Thirty-nine Articles*; and considering the heresy in which they are steeped, and their direct antagonism to Catholic doctrine, the word was not a whit too strong; and we might fancy S. Paul using it

of the form of doctrine which made him the persecutor of S. Stephen, without implying any unkindness to the friends whom he had left behind him. In fact, the more a convert loves the souls of old associates, the more he will detest the falsehoods that keep them from the happiness he himself enjoys ; and the more he values his own privileges, the more will he "shudder" at the thought of throwing them away, and returning to his old bondage. As for the expression "shivering" at the thought of the Anglican worship, it is perhaps unintelligible to Dr. Howson, who probably has had no personal experience of Catholic worship. But to any one who has had that experience, and is able to compare that worship with its dreary counterpart in the Establishment, the expression will appear remarkably happy. In fact, both the participles used by Dr. Newman are most accurately and exquisitely appropriate ; and his sentence puts into the convenient form of an epigram exactly what is felt by thousands besides himself as to heretical formularies on the one hand, and lifeless and loveless services on the other. Dr. Howson may think the words too strong—"quite unkind"—but if Dr. Newman had spoken more softly, the chances are that some one would ingeniously have discovered that he did not mean to deny a regretful longing after "his former position." But in any case, Dr. Howson ought certainly not to have made this attack on Dr. Newman without remembering the occasion on which the words were used.

S. Thomas of Canterbury. A Sermon preached in the Church of S. Carlo, in Rome, by HENRY EDWARD MANNING, D.D. London : Burns and Lambert. 1864.

ROME is the place in which the praises of S. Thomas of Canterbury are the most fitly spoken, England itself not being an exception ; for it was for the principles of which Rome is the head and source, and for the authority of which Rome is the seat, that he gave his life ; and so Rome is the place, not second even to England, in which S. Thomas should be held in honour as a martyr and champion. Add to this (as Dr. Manning points out), that we Englishmen "cannot gather up his dust from the soil of England, nor restore his tomb in the glories of 'Beckett's crown' at Canterbury, but that we may give back to him his sanctuary in the Holy City." Add also the memories of the men who came forth in the days of persecution from the venerable college of S. Thomas of the English *de Urbe* ; add, too, the need of our countrymen in Rome of a church served by priests of their own nation ; and lastly, take into consideration that the Holy Father feels that, as the principles for which S. Thomas died are now at stake, the present is the time for us to do honour to those principles by rebuilding his church in Rome ; and who can do otherwise than wish "God speed" to such a work ? In the sermon preached by the Provost of Westminster in Rome, the contest of S. Thomas with the world is well depicted. "The five liberties or immunities of the Church of God—the liberty of its patrimony, of its personal exemption, of its episcopal elections, of its powers of excommunication, and of its appeals to Rome"—are rapidly but clearly sketched, and the strife that S. Thomas waged for them is given with vividness and accuracy. How those

who have opposed the principles of S. Thomas have suffered, and how his cause is not of local but of universal interest, is dwelt upon with the preacher's habitual earnestness. We lay no passages before our readers; for, as the Sermon is published in behalf of the proposed church, we trust that its circulation may be so wide that extracts may be superfluous.

Lyra Eucharistica: Hymns and Verses on the Holy Communion, ancient and modern; with other Poems. Edited by the Rev. ORBY SHIPLEY, M.A. London: Longman. 1863.

Lyra Messianica: Hymns and Verses on the Life of Christ, ancient and modern; with other Poems. Edited by the Rev. ORBY SHIPLEY, M.A. London: Longman. 1864.

NEXT to theologians, the greatest literary benefactors to the Church have been her hymnographers. We happen to be writing on a day well fitted to remind us of this fact,—the feast of the great S. Thomas Aquinas, who shone like a burning light in both departments of religious lore. The sacred truths which the theologian elucidates in his study, the hymnist invests with those attributes of popular interest and poetic beauty which enable the faithful at large to appropriate and apply them as a portion of their own inheritance. But, besides the service which hymnographers have rendered to the children of the Church, they seem to have received a special mission with reference to those who are external to her. Many a one who shrinks from Catholic doctrine in a technical shape, has been gradually won over to it by the more engaging form which it assumes in the precatory or eucharistic language of the hymn. The “*Dies Iræ*” almost worked a conversion in Sir Walter Scott; the “*Stabat Mater*,” although as strong a witness to the Catholic doctrine of our Lady as any in existence, has elicited the enthusiastic praise of many who can see no ground of sympathy in the general features of the Church's devotion to her; and those who decline to receive the mystery of the Blessed Eucharist in its dogmatic representation, can yet admire the marvellous completeness in which it is set forth and illustrated in the “*Lauda Sion*.” We suppose it must be that people receive much of the doctrine which is taught in the hymns, under the limitation of “poetic license;” but anyhow, so it is, that the conditions under which it is there modified without being pared down, render them strangely tolerant of it.

Mr. Shipley belongs to another and far more interesting class of men, who have been won, or are in course of being won, to the Church by the works of her sacred bards. Like many who have preceded him on the same road, he has felt the barrenness of that “*terra deserta et in via, et iniqua*,” in which his religious lot has been cast, as exhibited more especially in the total absence of any authorized supply for the wants of an enthusiastic devotion; and he has been directed to the true source from which this need is to be satisfied—the treasures of Catholic hymnology. He will soon, we trust, be led still farther by finding that our hymnology is but part of a great system, which, to be received effectually, must be received entire. Our hymns, divorced from the majestic ritual to which they belong, are, as was

observed some five-and-twenty years ago, like the "finials," or other ornaments of some beautiful church, torn from the connection which gives them their true propriety. Meanwhile Catholics themselves may well be grateful to Mr. Shipley, not only for presenting to them some of their old favourites in the form of a spirited and elegant translation, but for introducing to them many choice specimens in the same department with which they are less familiar. Nothing which we have said elsewhere in protest against the practice of allowing the æsthetical side of religion to outweigh the dogmatical and ascetic, must be understood to include writers who, like Mr. Shipley, are evidently feeling their way to the Truth by the road of inquiry marked out for them by the peculiar bias of their habitual studies and congenial tastes. We would, however, express a hope, that in any future edition of his "*Lyra Eucharistica*," the author would omit a few modern pieces of doubtful orthodoxy.

How and Why I became a Catholic. A Letter to Friends in the Church of England. By W. R. BROWNLOW, M.A., of Trinity College, Cambridge, London: Burns and Lambert. 1864.

THE ways are very various by which a non-Catholic may be led to recognize the obligation of submitting to the Church; and all (speaking generally) are good and satisfactory. But we confess that the particular way with which we have the greatest sympathy is that trodden by Mr. Brownlow, who owes his present happiness, not so much to a course of intellectual investigation and controversial study, as to his habit of labouring to follow faithfully God's guidance in those successive positions assigned to him by Divine Providence. And the present pamphlet possesses a peculiar charm from the circumstance that it does not attempt, in any great degree, an argumentative defence of Catholicism, but is rather devoted to a simple and most interesting account of its author's past religious history.

Accordingly, in an early page he takes the opportunity of protesting against a certain misconception of Catholic doctrine which is widely prevalent among Protestants. They imagine a Catholic convert to imply by the very fact of his conversion that his pre-Catholic life has been almost entirely external to the supernatural order; that he has not been acting under the Holy Ghost's influence at all, except in that period during which he has been consciously advancing towards the Catholic Church. But Catholic doctrine involves no kind of obligation to hold any such opinion, and we are confident that it is an entirely mistaken one. "I can see, on looking back," says Mr. Brownlow (p. 9), "how wonderfully God's grace has striven with me and saved me. How, in spite of my sins, it has made me the instrument of imparting grace and truth to others. I do not, and God forbid that I ever should, doubt the reality of that supernatural grace which sought me wandering as a lost sheep, which convinced me of my sins, . . . and of my ingratitude towards Him who had loved me." Not only does he speak most highly of many members of the Establishment, but even of the Wesleyans he says (p. 20): "I can bear witness to the consistent lives of many who have thus received a real change of heart."

It seems to us, however, we confess, that there is a certain confusion of language, and possibly of thought, in his remarks (p. 15) about the Evangelicals." "The piety after which they are striving," he says, "is the piety of the Old Testament; and they, and their Puritan forefathers, have naturally adopted Old Testament saints as their models." Yet in this very page he seems to identify the doctrine of the "Evangelicals" with that of "Luther and Calvin," though he does not expressly say so; and some might infer, therefore, that he regards Luther and Calvin as true exponents of Old Testament piety. He would, no doubt, indignantly repudiate any such idea; yet we question whether he has accurately thought out his own meaning. The proposition, however, which, we suspect, he really had in his mind, is one with which we ourselves most cordially concur. There may be many Protestants, we understand him to mean, whose good instincts preserve them from *really holding* those Lutheran blasphemies and impieties which they *profess*, whether on justification by faith only, or on other kindred subjects; yet even these have not, except in the rarest possible instances, any higher standard of perfection than that exhibited in the Old Testament.

It must not be supposed, from what we said at starting, that no controversial arguments at all are contained in this little pamphlet; and we may add, that all which it does contain are most admirable of their kind. This is particularly due to Mr. Brownlow's remarkable moderation of language and thought, and his sensitive reluctance to press an argument one step further than it will legitimately go. Perhaps his moderation is somewhat immoderate; yet it is a fault altogether on the right side, and the practical lesson which it teaches us is of special importance in the present anxious crisis of thought.

The following is, for more than one reason, worthy of quotation:—"I had no previous acquaintance with Dr. Newman, beyond public report that he *did not attempt to urge people beyond their convictions*; and a letter I had seen of his to a friend explaining a point of Catholic teaching. The frank and open way in which, in reply to me, he went fully into my difficulties, *not glossing them over, but allowing them their full force*, soon convinced me that there was nothing to conceal. . . . By the time I reached the Oratory my difficulties were at an end" (p. 65).

There is only one sentence of Mr. Brownlow, from first to last, which gives us pain. It is one in which he apparently identifies himself (p. 57) with M. de Montalembert's unhappy pronouncement at Malines, on "the principle of religious liberty." But this question is so entirely heterogeneous to the general contents of the pamphlet, that there is no call for entering here into its discussion.

It is impossible to read Mr. Brownlow's history without musing over the question, how many Anglicans there may be still moving slowly along that path from which he has so happily emerged. There are true servants of God—let us hope many in number—who, from the circumstances in which God Himself has placed them, have had their whole religious life and habits formed in a mould which is very far from explicitly Catholic. With such men conversion to Catholicism is often a slow, difficult, and laborious process; and as much harm may be done by pressing the inquirer unduly forward, as by allowing him to remain indolently contented with his

existing position. In our article on the "Union" movement we have earnestly urged that the greatest tenderness and sympathy are due to such men from a well-instructed Catholic, and that he will ever be forward to make the utmost allowance for their manifold perplexities and misconceptions. A still keener perception of this truth is perhaps the most practical inference to be drawn from the pamphlet before us; and it is the one with which Mr. Brownlow himself will most unreservedly coincide.

The London Oratory and Mr. Newdegate, M.P. Two Letters by JOHN BERNARD DALGAIRNS, Priest of the Oratory of S. Philip Neri. London: Richardson.

WE must not omit a brief reference to this triumphant vindication of the London Oratory in general and of the late F. Hutchison in particular. It would really seem—considering the Santiago case, the Kingsley and Newman correspondence, and now this affair of the Sydenham Cemetery—that Protestants of late have been indulging in a system of attack upon us which even for them is unusually weak and absurd, only for the purpose of bringing down on their own heads crushing and overwhelming answers. Mr. Kingsley himself hardly presents a more pitiable appearance in F. Newman's pages, than does Mr. Smee in those of F. Dalgairns.

Stromata Pro catholicis: a Series of Papers, principally Pro catholic, or antidotal to Antichristianism; to which are prefixed *Letters on Paper-preaching*. By E. W. ATTWOOD, B.A., for some time Curate of S. Leonard's, Shoreditch. London: Waterlow. 1864.

MANY of the papers here collected were originally published as letters addressed to a Protestant newspaper; but (whatever may have been the form in which they first appeared) as now revised and enlarged by the author, they are decidedly and uncompromisingly Catholic in their spirit, substance, and argument. The result is a remarkable volume, the product of a vigorous, earnest mind, engaged on some of the practical, stirring questions, moral, religious, and theological, of the present time. The diction is at times quaint, perhaps a little peculiar; but the reader forgets any fault of style in the outspokenness and thorough heartiness of the man, and in the native strength and freedom with which he writes. The papers, which treat of a variety of subjects, all, however, conducing to the general purpose of the work, are illustrated by notes of an historical and anecdotal character, combining personal reminiscences and experiences with curious bits of information about men and books, which almost invest the work with the freshness of an autobiography.

In a publication which contains opinions on so many topics, there will necessarily be some with which the reader may not altogether agree; and we have noticed a few epithets and other expressions which strike us as incongruous. How, for instance, can the writer speak of Pope as "a steadfast

Catholic" ? And why *has* he printed his Greek quotations in Roman characters ?

Though the subjects treated are all of present interest, the book has a certain flavour about it which is not modern, and reminds us of some of the papers in the "Spectator," and other kindred publications of that or a later date. We may add that a high moral tone pervades the whole. The contents of the volume have interested us much, and we should be glad to be instrumental in making it better known.

The Spiritual Retreat of the Rev. F. Colombière, of the Society of Jesus.
Translated from the French, with a Preface by the Right Rev. Dr.
MANNING. Dublin : Duffy. 1863.

FATHER COLOMBIÈRE'S name is intimately united in the minds of Catholics with that of the Venerable Margaret Mary Alacoque, and through her with the previous work, in which he acted as her fervent co-adjutor,—the propagation of the devotion to the Sacred Heart. We English Catholics recall also with satisfaction his labours in our own country, which seem to give us an additional relationship to this good and holy man, and increase our pleasure at anything which brings us into closer acquaintance with him.

Nothing can better serve this end than his own diary of the workings of his mind during a spiritual retreat. A private diary always gives us a special confidential knowledge of a man : it has been written for his own eye alone ; yet it is never a complete, often not a wholly reliable, document. No one lets even a piece of paper wholly into the secret ; and, we may add, that without the searchings of a good will aided by the lamp of grace, no one is altogether in his own secret. This is a diary, written in the sight of God and by the help of God. Many devotional assistances to a retreat have been penned and found profitable, but suggested reflections, good and true as they may be, fail of the potency possessed by the exhibition of a living mind producing them under the same influences which we desire to bring to bear upon ourselves. Example we know is better than precept, and devotion is kindled much more readily by infection, as it were, than by any other process. We have here, moreover, the advantage of seeing experimentally upon how broad a basis of self-knowledge the spiritual edifice must be raised ; and we know that all devotion will prove a mere temporary sensible ebullition which has not this solid foundation. How rapid was the progress of F. Colombière, and how thoroughly he vanquished the domestic foe he most dreaded in the active life to which he was called, vainglory,—not, of course, of the vulgar sort, but that secret resting with satisfaction in external good works,—we may gather from his short notices of a retreat made two years later in London.

The Love of Religious Perfection ; or, How to awaken, increase, and preserve it in the Religious Soul. By F. JOSEPH BAYMA, of the Society of Jesus. Translated from the Latin by a Member of the same Society. Dublin : Duffy. 1863.

WE have here another valuable contribution, in a small compass, to our aids in the cultivation of the inner life. The work is composed in a form which will render it very acceptable to such as read spiritual books in a meditative manner—the only way in which they are likely to make a permanent impression. We mean that it is broken up into short sentences, each complete in itself, after the plan of the “Imitation of Christ.” Nor does the resemblance end with the form : and it is, perhaps, the highest praise we can bestow on a work of this kind, to say that it strongly reminds us, in the depth and condensation of its spiritual aphorisms, conjoined with a perfect simplicity, of that familiar treasury of piety which has fed the interior life of so many who have lacked any other help which books could give, and which, in days when we abound in such devotional aids, is still as fresh and welcome as ever.

It is not every work which would bear being thus broken up into short sentences. The proverbial form, which presents condensed lessons of wisdom, has grown unfamiliar to modern ways of thought ; but it has its own special excellencies. Truth is thus easily grasped, readily remembered, pondered, and appropriated. But then each sentence must contain its portion of gold ; and how few writings, comparatively, will allow of this minute subdivision and yet possess appreciable merit in each parcel ! Experience will be the surest test of the value to be set on this little book.

Industrial Biography : Iron Workers and Tool Makers. By SAMUEL SMILES, Author of “Lives of the Engineers.” London : Murray. 1863.

THE present work is designed by the author to be a continuation, in a more generally accessible form, of the series of memoirs of industrial men introduced into his “Lives of the Engineers.” He considers that the labours of celebrated inventors, mechanics, and iron-workers, who may be regarded as the main founders of the modern industry of Britain, are well worthy of being placed on record. The heroes of the sword—the wielders, not the welders, of iron—have hitherto almost wholly monopolized the historic page : some place is due to the patient, energetic, and courageous exertions of those men to whom society, as at present constituted, owes its very existence. We have no quarrel with this sentiment. So long as the results of labour and mechanic skill are not treated very much as the *summum bonum*, the sterling qualities which ought to animate and prompt them cannot be too highly recommended in their way. The Holy Father has lately spoken encouraging and favourable words of the exertions made to increase the well-being and prosperity of men in a material point of view, and has himself, as is well known, turned his attention benevolently in that

direction. We must also do Mr. Smiles the justice to observe that he appears to attach far higher importance to the moral qualities brought into play than to the valuable results achieved. The key-note of his theme was struck in "Self-Help," and the moral runs as an undertone through his subsequent works. We confess to preferring it in that more latent form; just as we think we enjoy and profit more by a brisk walk when not taken with a professed constitutional object, so we like a book the better when it fulfils its object without perpetually reminding us of what that object is. We might add that we have some slight misgivings as to whether our race, which it seems agreed to style the Anglo-Saxon, does not stand in greater need of lessons of another order than constant incentives to the energetic class of industrial virtues. The kingdom of nature, as well as that of Heaven, suffers violence, and the violent take it by force; and we seem to know well enough how to win our fair share of this world's prizes. However, we shall not complain of our author for aiming at what in itself is good and praise-worthy—the encouragement of honest industry and patient perseverance. He affects no more, and he does this well. The present volume is mainly intended to show the great influence which iron has exerted in the process of civilization, and the immense facilities in its application afforded by the improvement of tools. Most of the information embodied in the work, more especially that relating to the inventors of tools and machines, has, as Mr. Smiles tells us, heretofore existed only in the memories of the eminent mechanical engineers from whom it has been collected. In a few more years many of these facts would have passed into oblivion; and we owe the author no small thanks for the pains he has taken in collecting them, and for placing them before us in so agreeable and attractive a form.

Theologische Quartalschrift. Tübingen. 1864.

TWO distinct authors, Reuss and Renan, have lately maintained that S. John's Gospel was unknown to one of his contemporaries and disciples, to whom, had it then existed, it must necessarily have been familiar; namely, Papias. In the first article of the January number of the quarterly publication before us, Dr. Aberle produces direct testimony to show that Papias not only was acquainted with the Gospel in question, but that there was an early tradition that he was the amanuensis of the Evangelist. It is true that Eusebius, in vindication of his Canon, affirms that Papias made citations from the first epistle of S. John, but makes no mention of his name in connection with S. John's Gospel. From this negative argument it has been concluded that Papias was unacquainted with such a work, that its origin is subsequent to his time, and consequently that its authenticity is more than doubtful. But we must bear in mind that Eusebius had no occasion to appeal to Papias in defence of the work, as its genuineness was not called in question. Now for the direct testimony. There is a positive statement in a manuscript of the ninth century, now in the Vatican, which in all probability is a transcript from one of the fifth century, that Papias in his works did make mention of that Gospel; and, secondly, that he wrote it at the dictation of the Evangelist. The fragment containing the statement

was published by Cardinal Thomasius. So much for the negative proofs of infidel writers.

A second contribution to Biblical knowledge is given us by the same writer, in a clearer explanation of an obscure passage in Irenæus (III. i. 1), where he shows the meaning of that father of Church History to be, that the Gospels of S. Mark and S. Luke were written during the lifetime of S. Peter and S. Paul, but after their separation and departure to preach Christ to the world.

The succeeding article, by Dr. Kellner, treats of the dialogue called *Philopatris*, commonly inserted in the works of the satirist Lucian, and for a long time ascribed to that author. Dr. Kellner analyzes the dialogue and examines it at length. He argues, with Gesner and Niebuhr, from its general insipidity, from the extensive knowledge of Christian doctrine displayed in it—from its mention of persons of later date, and from allusions contained in it—that Lucian cannot have been its author. Niebuhr placed its composition in the time of Nicephorus Phocas; Dr. Aberle proposes to place it in the reign of Julian the Apostate. He agrees with Wieland in supposing that the object of the writer was to make the Christians objects of general detestation, by ridiculing their manners, conduct, and doctrines.

What, then, does Dr. Newman mean? A Reply to a Pamphlet lately published by Dr. Newman. By the Rev. CHARLES KINGSLEY. Macmillan & Co.

THIS pamphlet has appeared at the very end of the quarter. Under the head "Our Contemporaries" will be found a comment on the original correspondence, and in our next number we hope to exhibit, clearly and fully, the additional injury inflicted on Mr. Kingsley's literary character by his own pamphlet. Here we can only draw attention to one salient point. Mr. Kingsley had said, "Father Newman informs us that" "truth for its own sake" need not, and, on the whole, ought not, to be "a virtue with the Roman Clergy." This expression can only mean that F. Newman had published some passage or passages, of which such was the legitimate objective sense. F. Newman called earnestly, but called in vain, for the citation of one such passage or passages. Mr. Kingsley's pamphlet does not adduce one single word or sentence written by F. Newman, of which he can even pretend that such is its legitimate and obvious sense. And nevertheless, he still refuses to confess and apologize for the gross slander involved in his original statement.

We can only announce the appearance of *Sermons on Our Lord Jesus Christ, and on His Blessed Mother*, by his Eminence Cardinal Wiseman, which appears as we are going to press, and of which, therefore, we must reserve our notice.

The same remark applies to Mgr. Manning's *Letter to an Anglican Friend* on the recent Privy Council judgment, a subject of which we propose to treat at length in our next number.

In the department of Music we have to mention the publication of "A Mass for Four Voices," by Giulio Roberti (London : Novello & Co., Burns & Lambert), a composition already known to some extent by its having been performed on several occasions at the London Oratory. The work contains many passages of great merit, and we trust the author may be encouraged to pursue his artistic labours in this direction. Further thought and study will, we doubt not, enable him still more completely to avoid the faults of previous composers, and to accomplish, what is certainly a task of no mean difficulty,—the setting of the words of the Office of the Mass to music at once appropriate and attractive.

We have also to draw attention to a Mass for male Voices, by M. Gounod, of which a great portion was recently performed by Mr. Leslie's Choir. The writing is throughout scholarly and ecclesiastical.

Another considerable publication which deserves mention is Herr Schachner's Oratorio, "Israel's Return from Babylon" (Addison & Co.), performed in London two years ago, and at Worcester in September, 1863. On this last occasion, it was the one new work introduced at the Festival, and thus had the honour of being the "*pièce de resistance*," to which indeed its merits well entitled it. Considering what is too generally the quality of original *librettos*, we must admit that Herr Schachner has adopted the safest course in compiling his words from Holy Scripture and the sacred poems of Moore. The result, if not new, is at all events good; and the author has certainly found in the passages selected inspirations of no common kind. There is much in this oratorio calculated for effective performance by our provincial Choral Societies, and we are glad to bring it under notice with this view. There is a beautiful duet, "Hark! 'tis the breeze of evening," which, as it is to be had in a separate form, and may be sung by young ladies' or boys' voices, would be well worth introducing into our schools and colleges.

OUR CONTEMPORARIES.

AN eminent French writer of our time has remarked that very few of the men of the present day who have exercised much influence upon the minds of their fellow-countrymen have failed to avail themselves, from time to time, of the opportunities afforded them by the various organs of periodical literature. In England this is as undoubtedly true as in France or Germany. We may, on some accounts, regret the demand for ephemeral production which uses up, for the service of the moment, many gifts of mind and education that in other centuries would have been devoted to the slow and patient labour that is required for works that are to last, and that might thus, under other circumstances, have added to the imperishable treasures of our literature. But it is one thing to say that the most active and influen-

tial minds among us find in the periodicals of the time a ready and convenient mode of working upon the intelligence of the public, and quite another to say that this should be the only form under which their riches should be dispensed. For our present purpose, however, the fact is enough. Our periodical literature has never, perhaps, attained a higher average of excellence and of influence than at the present time; and it certainly has never been brought so much within the reach of every class. We have long been, and are becoming more and more every day, a reading nation. It is true that grave objections may be made to much of the material by which the ever-increasing demand is constantly supplied; and the appearance of a sound and solid work in any part of the vast field embraced by our literature is still a comparatively rare event. But the most cultivated writers of our generation are to be found, at least occasionally, among the workers even in the lightest and most ephemeral of our periodicals; and if we wish to understand or to study the mind and thoughts of Englishmen, we shall find them nowhere more faithfully reflected than in literature of this kind.

That all which relates to the Catholic Church—to her principles, doctrines, and institutions, and to the habits and devotions of her children—is a matter of the greatest interest to the generation in which we live, is a fact universally confessed; and it might also be proved, if necessary, by a reference to the class of publications of which we are speaking. It is no part of our present business to inquire into the causes of this interest. Its existence is testified by the constant mention of Catholic things and persons, and the frequent reference and allusion to subjects and questions more or less closely connected with the controversy between Protestantism and the Church. At the same time, it ought not to surprise us if the days of ignorant, or even of malicious, misrepresentation have not yet passed away. The men of our time inherit the traditions of their fathers as to Catholicism. They have laid aside the habit of proscription and persecution, and in many important matters have yielded a candid assent to the evidence of historical truth. A great deal has been done in disabusing the public mind of the accumulated falsehoods of more than three centuries; but a great deal still remains to do. Certain habits of unfairness and misconception have become so ingrained in the English mind, that the exposure of one calumny hardly makes our countrymen less disposed than before to believe another on the same subject. It is to this thorough Protestantism of the nation—a characteristic loudly vaunted and rejoiced in by some popular writers—that we are to attribute the quiet and unsuspicious manner in which men of noble character and deep learning so often hand on, without examination, some unfounded calumny of the early Reformers, or of the Protestant writers of the seventeenth century, and violate all ordinary rules of sound criticism and literary impartiality, when the Catholic Church is concerned. And yet, who can believe that such unfairness is deliberate and wilful? The men of whom we speak are no more indifferent to truth than they are incapable of grasping it when presented to them. Nor is the nation for which they write in love with falsehood for its own sake, but—at least, if we may believe certain writers, who seem to repeat the assertion, as if there were some great danger of its being forgotten—pre-eminently characterized by honesty, straightforwardness,

veracity, and common sense. We are firmly convinced that—as one of the greatest of English and Catholic writers told us years ago—our chief danger from our countrymen comes from our not being known. This conviction, together with a sense of the present importance of periodical literature, must be our excuse if we take the liberty, from time to time, of reviewing some of “our contemporaries,” with the object, mainly, of calling the attention, both of writers and readers, to instances of the not yet abandoned habit of misrepresentation on Catholic subjects, or to other matters of similar importance. At the same time, we are far from undertaking that no specimen of ignorance or misconception shall pass unnoticed; still less do we mean to deny ourselves the pleasure of remarking on the many admirable and instructive articles which are sure to be scattered, here and there, over the periodical literature of any three months that we may have to embrace in our retrospect.

We must, of course, begin with the *Quarterlies*; and among them the first place belongs by right to the *Edinburgh* and *Quarterly*. Notwithstanding the occasional brilliancy of other and younger Reviews, there seems little chance that the present generation will witness the dethronement of these two celebrated organs from their ancient pre-eminence. The last number of the *Quarterly* contains little that calls for special notice from us, though we may feel inclined to protest against certain passing assertions in an article on Gregorovius's recent book on *Medieval Rome*, and against the tone of roystering self-laudation in which the writer of the article on “New Englanders and the Old Home” has indulged. It is an answer to the attack on this country by Mr. Nathaniel Hawthorne. It seems to have been thought that the only way to answer a Yankee was to write like a Yankee. We meet with this kind of thing often enough in the leading articles of the *Times*; but the writers in the *Quarterly* should leave it to Mr. Thomas Towers. The *Edinburgh Review* of last January contained an article on the history of “Scottish Religious Houses Abroad,” dwelling chiefly on the great foundation of St. James's at Ratisbon, and its affiliated houses. In this article there is much information interesting to Catholics; we must pass on, however, to the article on a book which is just now drawing to itself a great deal of attention—Mr. Froude's “History of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth.” The general tone of the article is fair and judicious. It admits the complete collapse of the character of Elizabeth, which is the result of Mr. Froude's narrative, and, at the same time, points out a part at least of the ruthless unfairness with which that writer has sought to compensate for the blow he has administered to Protestant prejudice, by painting Mary Queen of Scots in the blackest colours. If we find fault with an incidental expression in this article, it is because it furnishes us with an excellent example of the manner in which an exploded Protestant tradition holds its ground in our literature, and turns up in full vigour long after it might have been supposed to be dead. No one ought to write on the history of the Reformation and the time that immediately succeeded it, without having read Dr. Maitland's *Essays*. But, if we may judge from certain expressions in the article of which we are speaking, its author has either not met with Dr. Maitland's

work, or has forgotten what is to be found there. He speaks of "the modicum of virtue which lurked in the cruel nature of Gardiner, and even in the brutal character of Bonner." Nobody denies that both these bishops had their faults, that both at times behaved ill; still both suffered much, and a good deal of evidence has been brought together, which exonerates them from the charges commonly made against them, and which a writer in the *Edinburgh Review* ought to have taken into account. Bonner may have been hot-tempered, and he had at times a rough tongue; but his age was a rough and coarse one, and he had to deal with the most insolent of criminals. It is as absurd to call him "bloody-minded" (as Dr. Maitland shows) as it would be to apply the same word to a judge in the last century, who administered the law by which forgers were hanged. Dr. Maitland shows that he was "straightforward, hearty, familiar, humorous, obviously placable and easily entreated; capable of bearing much reviling and low abuse against himself, his order, and the doctrines of his Church, for maintaining which he had himself suffered the loss of all things."—(*Essays on the Reformation*, p. 623.) Such a man does not deserve to be alluded to as "brutal."

We must pass on rapidly through other periodicals of the same class with the *Edinburgh*. The *North British Review*, so often conspicuous for the excellence of its articles, contains the best notice of the late Mr. Thackeray that we have yet seen. The *Christian Remembrancer* has some very ludicrous passages in an article on Eugénie de Guérin, which we may well cite as a specimen of a second, and much more offensive kind of treatment to which Catholic subjects are exposed. The writers with whom we have to deal, in this case, belong to that small section in the Establishment which still calls itself by the name "Anglo-Catholic," and inherits many of the traditions of "Tractarianism," without its (so-called) Romanizing tendencies. These people do worse than abuse Catholicism—they patronize it. They are astoundingly ignorant of its practices, and yet they are ready with theories and "views" about them, and undertake to explain the principles on which the whole system is based, and to point out its strong and its weak parts. They know so much about it, on their own showing, that one is tempted to ask whether they were consulted when the institutions of the Church were arranged. Their gift of penetration extends to Catholic persons as well as to Catholic things: they understand all our feelings and motives, and are particularly deep in pointing out how the best of us distinguish between what is "Catholic" and what is "Roman." Thus, the worthy critic (he or she?) on Eugénie de Guérin thinks it quite a discovery that a young Catholic lady, speaking of the month of Mary, "should be looking beyond her Madonna all the time, though she does not know it;" and actually remarks—on her mentioning a miracle "with the comment, *J'y crois fortement*"—"but the adverb proves that it was but a comparative belief at best" (p. 17). Eugénie de Guérin, pure, innocent, happy in her religion and its devotions, writes a diary in which, compared "with diaries left by equally religious persons of other communions, there is almost no self-reproach or accusation." Wonderful fact! The writer must account for it in his (or her) own way. In those other cases, perhaps "the diary served one minor purpose of the confessional, and relieved the mind of its outpourings and criticism of its own doings." But

now we must have a generalization. "No doubt the entire Roman system has a tendency to take people off their own minds"—we suppose, because it makes self-examination so very important and essential a part of everyday life?—"judging for them of the amount and value of their penitence, and taking periodical stock of their progress; so that even with the most humble, sincere, and contrite, there must necessarily be a more entire sense that the repentance has been weighed, and that the past may be left behind. *We do not say that this is safe or wholesome*, but there can be no question that it produces more present ease, and destroys scrupulous self-consciousness and self-tormenting." Here we have speculations as to the effect of a "system" of which the writer knows nothing; and it is apparently thought a thing that requires defence that there should be a part in it that, supposing right dispositions, insures the peace of soul which follows on the forgiveness of past sin. It is not "safe or wholesome," but it may have its good effect. Was it "safe or wholesome" for Magdalene to hear, "*Thy sins are forgiven thee*," and "*Go in peace*"? Was the *Miserere* written by David after, or before, he had heard "*The Lord also hath taken away thy sin, thou shalt not die*"? Had S. Paul "a more entire sense that his repentance had been weighed, and that the past might be left behind," because he was told, "*Rise up, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, invoking His name*"? This critic writes as if the question about "systems" was to be settled by our own ideas of what may be their possible tendencies, instead of by the simple inquiry, what our Lord has chosen should be the way in which sins are to be dealt with in His Church. But even if so great an absurdity were to be for a moment granted, the writer entirely forgets that it is a question of alternatives. We have the choice between making no confession, and absolving ourselves, or making a confession, and letting a priest absolve us. Even if there were no such thing as the Sacrament of Penance, or the Power of Absolution, the process in the second case would be far more sure and far more humiliating than in the first, and so would, as a general rule, bring far more peace. But "the most dangerous practical evil of the system," continues the writer is—what? "*the continuing in sin that grace may abound*." And how with the other "system"—of people who do not make confessions? If they absolve themselves, this very danger ought to be all the greater: if they do not, their practice is something very like—if we may use such an expression—"the continuing in sin that grace may not abound." And then the critic goes on to contrast poor Eugénie with the Curé d'Ars! "We feel how utterly Romish his Church has become, and how little we have in common with him; while we can scarcely turn a page of Eugénie's writings without feeling how Catholic is her Church, and how much we have still in common." Put Eugénie de Guérin between her critic and the Curé d'Ars: she will kneel at the feet of the one for his blessing, but from the other—notwithstanding the assurance "how much we have still in common"—she will turn with a slight but decided shudder, not without a lurking smile at the intense absurdity of the offer to fraternize.

But our space is failing, and we have yet to do justice to what, perhaps, we may call the most prominent incident of the past quarter with reference to our literary periodicals. It is doubtless, in part, familiar to most of our

readers, but the full history of the affair may still bear telling. We have already alluded to the damaging effect of Mr. Froude's late volumes upon the character of Queen Elizabeth. "As the case stands," says the critic in the *Edinburgh Review*, "we fear the probability is that Leicester's wife came to a foul end; that his relations with the Queen, both before and after the murder, were of a most objectionable, if not of a dishonourable kind; that she was ready to marry him, notwithstanding her strong suspicion, too probably her assurance, of his crime; and that she was, in the eye of Heaven, which judges by the intent, and not by the act, nearer than Englishmen would like to believe to the guilt of an adulteress and a murderess." The same writer, by no means prejudiced, adds, "The general effect of these volumes is lowering to the political, as well as to the personal, character of Elizabeth. . . . Passion and vanity rule her conduct, and there is no cause which she is not ready to sacrifice to a criminal love." We are not at present reviewing Mr. Froude: but such being the impression made by his volumes on an Edinburgh reviewer, it is no wonder that the same volumes should have put an "intensely Protestant writer"—to use one of his own terms—like Mr. Kingsley, out of temper. Not, however, with their author—for, after all, he is perhaps to some extent a kindred spirit to Mr. Kingsley; though we must do him the justice to say that he certainly would never have penned the attack on Dr. Newman of which we are about to speak. Mr. Kingsley's article on Mr. Froude's history appeared in *Macmillan's Magazine* for January. It is, like almost everything that Mr. Kingsley writes, dashing and vigorous in expression, but illogical, violent, and abusive. In the course of this document, Mr. Kingsley, as in duty bound, begins to apologize for the "failings" of Queen Elizabeth—her avarice, her lying, and her licentiousness. Mr. Kingsley, as we shall see, is a great advocate for truthfulness—it is his "weak point;" common morality hardly satisfies his high conceptions with regard to it, and he can even detect a subtle laxity in that respect where no one else has ever been able to perceive it. Yet, when we turn to his own vindication of Elizabeth on the points we have mentioned, we are quite surprised to see that the question with him is, not what is true, but what ought to be true. How can Mr. Froude speak of the avarice of Elizabeth? it is all very well for a republican writer, like Mr. Motley: surely she is excusable for not throwing good money after bad; and so on. Then, as to her duplicity and lying—ah, that can't be denied; "but her falsehoods"—not unlike those of a certain apologist of hers—"brought their own punishment, so swiftly and so surely, that they cured themselves." And, then, "we must remember that the morality of the time was low."

This is certainly a very stale device. There is hardly a single bad character in history, who has ever found a defender at all, for whom it has not been said that "his faults were those of his age, and his good qualities were his own." Mr. Kingsley, however, improves on this old trick. How could the age of that "bright Occidental star," of whom he is speaking, be one of low morality? Was it not the age which entered into the possession of the labours of the Reformers? Was it not the time when Scripture truth began to hold sway, and the lies and mummeries of superstition lost their debasing hold upon men? Ah, but, says Mr. Kingsley, Popery had made men so bad

that for the first generation or two the improvement was very partial. As far as telling the exact truth goes—for that is the point of which Mr. Kingsley is speaking—we are afraid that with some Protestants the improvement is still an affair of the future. Mr. Kingsley immediately gives us an outburst of abusive eloquence regarding the Catholic Church, of which we shall simply say that it seems to be ingeniously crammed with the greatest amount of misrepresentation possible in the space. From the top of the first column of page 217, where Mr. Kingsley asserts that it was a dogma that the Pope of Rome had the power of creating right and wrong, down to the end of the same column in the following page, where he says that the Pope would have been able and willing to divorce Dudley from his wife and allow him to marry the Queen, there is not a single historical statement, with regard to the Roman Church, which is not either the simple invention of Mr. Kingsley, or the perversion of some plain fact, or the exaggeration of some old lie. After this follows his defence of the Queen on the score of her conduct with Leicester,—where he fairly stands up for her as having been “*honestly* and deeply in love with a man who had been the friend of her youth,” and who was the husband of another woman, who was murdered because she was in the way.

The name of Mr. Kingsley—although he is Professor of History at Cambridge—does not generally add much weight to any historical assertion to which it is affixed. No doubt he has his admirers—but not exactly on this point. His career has not been of such a character as to secure him a reputation either for historical learning or for dispassionate judgment. He writes in a slapdash, rollicking, but very affected style, and people seem inclined to consider him a privileged person as to the assertions he may chance to make—like the court jesters of old time, who were not supposed to mean what they said; nor did any one much care whether they did or not. So it is probable that this really remarkable specimen of his vituperative and inventive powers might have been left unnoticed, but for a passing blow that it contained at Dr. Newman. “Truth, for its own sake, had never been a virtue with the Roman clergy. Father Newman informs us that it need not, and on the whole ought not to be: that cunning is the weapon which Heaven has given to the saints wherewith to withstand the brute male force of the wicked world which marries and is given in marriage.” A slander against a living writer was, of course, more likely to bring Mr. Kingsley into trouble than any number of calumnies against the Catholic Church. We need not repeat the substance of the correspondence that followed, for we cannot doubt that our readers have long since made themselves acquainted with it. But, of course, the accusation of lying which Mr. Kingsley was hurling so recklessly against the Catholic Church and whole generations of her children, came back at once upon himself. This, however, does not fully state the damage that he has inflicted on his own character. He has wounded himself just where he was supposed to be strong. He *was* supposed to have what a friendly writer has called a “brave English mind”—that kind of straightforward, bulldog, generous character, that hates deceit, injustice, and, above all, everything like shuffling and sneaking. But the part he has chosen to play with regard to Dr. Newman must for ever fix this particular stigma

upon him. He makes a charge, unsupported by any authority. When challenged, he refers to one of Dr. Newman's Protestant sermons, but gives no particular passage. Of this sermon a Protestant critic (in the *Spectator*) says, "The sermon in question, which we have carefully read, certainly contains no proposition of the kind to which Mr. Kingsley alludes, and no language even so like it as the text taken from our Lord's own words, 'Be ye wise as serpents and harmless as doves.'" Again called to account, Mr. Kingsley apologized; but his apology was couched in that particularly disingenuous form which insinuates a renewal of the charge that is professedly withdrawn. "As the tone of your letter makes me feel that my opinion of the meaning of *your words* was a mistaken one, I shall send at once to *Macmillan's Magazine* the few lines which I enclose." What are the lines? They contain, by implication, the distinctly false assertion—an assertion which, if true, could be at once proved—that there *are* some words of Dr. Newman which Mr. Kingsley mistook. "Dr. Newman has, by letter, expressed in the strongest terms his denial of the meaning which I put upon his words. No man knows the use of words better than Dr. Newman; no man, therefore, has a better right to define what he does, or does not, mean by them." And, on further remonstrance, Mr. Kingsley alters his apology by the withdrawal of the second sentence now quoted by us, not the first. And he concludes his correspondence with Dr. Newman thus:—"Having frankly accepted your assertion that I was mistaken, I have done as much as one English gentleman can expect from another."

We think that the time will come when Mr. Kingsley will regret his refusal to explain himself further. His allusion to the character of the "English gentleman" is certainly unfortunate—nearly as much so as his friend's phrase of the "brave English mind." Englishmen do not show their courage by making personal attacks which they cannot support, and then shuffling about an apology. The "English gentleman," who, we suppose, is the modern representative of the Christian chivalry of older times, at least as far as regards the principles of personal conduct, would, we think, feel himself dishonoured and disgraced by the position in which Mr. Kingsley has placed himself. On lower grounds also Mr. Kingsley has made a mistake. His readers will bear a good deal from him, and allow him to stand on his head, jump through a hoop, and perform other "muscular" gambols for their amusement, without feeling him a bore. They have already been very indulgent to him, for the sake of the air of Saxon frankness and plainness of speech that he has assumed. But his literary career has not been exactly of that kind which would make it safe for him to set up as a severe censor of other writers. Indeed, there is something irresistibly ludicrous in the selection that he has made out of the many points on which he might have attacked the Catholic Church, with good hope of pleasing his readers. Truthfulness to wit! Has Mr. Kingsley forgotten the name of an earlier Elizabeth than the daughter of Anne Boleyn, and a certain Latin life of that saintly Landgravine of Thuringia, on which he founded the work by which he first became generally known as an author? Is he prepared to maintain that there is no exaggeration of fact, no distortion of character, no perversion or suppression of the testimony of the old chronicler, and no

inventions of his own about the "Saint's Tragedy?" And yet that work was introduced to the world with an artifice worthy of an Elizabethan statesman. Mr. Maurice, who we can hardly think had done what he certainly never said he had done—that is, compared the work with the original history on which it is professedly based—vouched, in an Introduction, for the thorough fidelity of the author to his text. He denounced, in very strong language (p. xiv.), "the exceeding wickedness of the desire to distort or suppress a fact, or misrepresent a character," and expressed a hope that writers such as Mr. Kingsley would "ask as solemnly to be delivered from the temptation to this, as to any crime which is punished by law." Then, after saying that the clergy had "erred grievously in perverting history to their own purposes," and that what "was a sin in others was in them a blasphemy, because they professed to acknowledge God as the ruler of the world,"—a profession of which we were not aware that it was confined to the clergy among Protestants—Mr. Maurice declared that he "looked upon this play as an effort in the direction" of better things. This it most certainly was not, as any one who takes the trouble to read the old life of Theodoric of Appold, and compare it with Mr. Kingsley's drama, will easily see. The main idea of the book—that there was a "degrading and agonizing" conflict in the mind of S. Elizabeth, between "healthy human affection" and a Manichæan idea of the unlawfulness of married life and its relations—is, we need hardly say, a creation of Mr. Kingsley's own brain, and perfectly unjustified by anything to be found in Theodoric. Other Protestants have been far more fair to this particular saint; but it is, of course, no new thing for such writers to mistake and misrepresent a character like that of S. Elizabeth. But it is one thing to do this, and another to get a writer of considerable reputation to declare that you have not done it.* Mr. Kingsley's own friends and admirers do not give him much credit for caring what he says:—"His habit of mind," says a writer in the *Saturday Review*, "is a very unfortunate one for a serious investigation of truth. He is only deficient in the accomplishments of accuracy and gravity. To weigh his words is not so important as to calculate their force." That is, he makes it more his business to state things *strongly* than to state them *truly*. "Lively, impetuous, vigorous, hasty, too quick in forming judgments, and too vehement in expressing them, he is a brilliant partisan, but a very unsafe teacher." A "brilliant partisan," we suppose, is one who makes it his object to state, not what is *true*, but what is damaging to an enemy. "It is not that he would intentionally disregard truth"—how do people feel when an apology of this kind must be made for

* It is not our purpose to enter into the general question of Mr. Kingsley's character as a writer; but we are, of course, aware that it is open to still graver criticism on other points besides that of historical truthfulness. Dr. Newman may, perhaps, have touched unconsciously on a sore subject, when he spoke in one of his letters of the difference that is to be discerned between Catholics and Protestants as to certain other virtues besides truth. It is not that which constitutes the main objection—urged so energetically and courageously on a late occasion at Oxford—against books like *Yeast*, *Hypatia*, and others of which Mr. Kingsley knows something.

them?—"but he is so anxious to get to a conclusion, and so very heedless in impressing his conclusions strongly upon others, that *he is apt to be careless in investigating the grounds of what ought to be his judgments, but what are his prejudices.*" If the periphrastic sentence, part of which we have italicised, means anything, it means this:—Mr. Kingsley does not say what he knows to be false; but he states as true a great many things that he has no ground for asserting. "He is the most sensational writer of history who ever disdained the labour of reading." Such is Mr. Kingsley's literary character:—and this is the man who attacks Dr. Newman, and dashes off brilliant tirades, full of statements, "the grounds of which he has been careless in investigating," against the Catholic Church. Cambridge ought to be proud of her Professor of History. But what does she think of his last discovery, as to the manner in which an "English gentleman" ought to behave when he has made a personal charge, and is unable to substantiate it?

We may perhaps allow ourselves, in conclusion, to say a single word upon Dr. Newman's part in this affair; or rather, let us leave Mr. Kingsley to recover from the chastisement he has received, and ask a question as to the general manner in which Dr. Newman is treated by English writers. Why is it that a man whose genius is so universally admired—whose name will be handed down, at all events, as that of one of the great intellectual and literary glories of this generation—in whose lofty integrity no flaw has ever been detected—who has always been courteous and forbearing, almost to excess, in his controversial dealings, and who has, to all appearance, withdrawn himself into the quiet duties of his own immediate vocation,—why is it that Dr. Newman is so continually assailed by misrepresentation, calumny, and every kind of literary unfairness? The history of his treatment at Anglican hands is almost worth writing. At one time his books must not be advertised; while those who were afraid to read them talked glibly of their subject-matter, on the strength of the answers and *critiques* that they were not afraid to read. Then, after the attempt to ignore him had failed, they tried the plan of spreading false rumours about him. Every movement was interpreted in some sinister manner. He could not build a house to live in with his companions, but there must be spies examining the cellars. Then he was said to be on his way back to Anglicanism, or on his way forward to something still more cheerless than that. Now, as we have remarked elsewhere, we can hardly take up an Anglican book on any theological subject without finding a skit at Dr. Newman, the author of which frequently borrows from him almost at the same moment. His name turns up frequently, even in other Protestant literature, in such books as Alford's Greek Testament, Smith's Dictionary, or Dr. Macleod's *Good Words*. Without endeavouring fully to answer our own question, we may at all events safely conclude from all this, that Anglican and Protestant writers cannot forget Dr. Newman if they would. His image seems to haunt them, like the silent phantom in *Æschylus*—*ἄτιμος, ἀλοιδόρος, ἄδιστος ἀφαιμένων ἰδεῖν*.* All this carping and cavilling—this attempt first to consign him to oblivion, and now to load him

* Agam. 400 (Conington).

with obloquy—is but a witness to the greatness of the work that has been accomplished by his writings and by his example. It is a perpetual “*talis quam sis, utinam noster esses!*” It is a continual proof that that work is going on, and that in his silence and retirement Dr. Newman is drawing after him many hearts, and rebuking many intellects that would fain shrink from the light which it has been his providential mission to kindle. This kind of abiding, silent, unsought influence upon the minds of his fellow-countrymen, is something far greater and nobler than ephemeral popularity or universal applause. It is the glory of genius, softened by the shadow of the Cross. Dr. Newman is the last person to value this influence for its own sake; but amid the snarlings of petty detractors, and the continued evil opinion of many from whom greater generosity might have been expected, it may be in some measure a comfort to look on it as a sign that the movement in which he has borne so prominent a part, is still powerfully leavening the intelligence of Englishmen; and thus, by the help of Divine grace, winning back souls to Catholic faith and unity, from the very side of those who so greatly fear and so recklessly malign him.

Foreign Periodical Literature.

THE HOLY ALLIANCE AND EUROPEAN ARBITRATION.

Civiltà Cattolica, January and December. 1863.

WE shall here bring into juxtaposition two articles* which appeared respectively at the commencement and the close of the past year in the *Civiltà Cattolica*, on account of the identity in principle which marks the writers' treatment of the subjects. We will take them in their chronological order.

A severe judgment had been passed in a previous volume on the much celebrated, and by many good and piously-disposed persons much lauded, Holy Alliance. In it they had hailed a new direction upon which modern diplomacy was avowedly and deliberately entering. The Holy Alliance professed to take the Gospel as its rule; it proclaimed the sovereignty of the One Only God and Saviour; its express object being to bind kings and people together in the common acknowledgment of this truth, and in the practice of a fraternal charity springing therefrom. There was here, in fact, an attempt to reconstitute a Christian basis, and to erect a barrier against the irreligion and infidelity of which Europe had tasted the bitter fruits, and by which the teeth of kings might well have been set on edge. Nevertheless, our writers defined the Holy Alliance as a "Return to a Protestant Gospel." They saw in it but a compromise between the spirit of conciliation and soft philanthropy of pietism on the one side, and heterodox independence on the other. Traces of this can be perceived in its very wording; and such was the natural consequence of its being an agreement sanctioned and entered into by three powers divided in their religious profession. Clearly they could only meet upon a common ground of reverence for the spirit and precepts of the Gospel and a vague recognition of Jesus Christ as their Supreme Lord.

This respectable document consists of three articles; to which are appended the names of Francis of Austria, Frederick William of Prussia, and Alexander of Russia; but, as is well known, it originated with Alexander. Regarded as the expression of the pious instinct and the just and benevolent desires of that religious and amiable sovereign, it may claim, not only our approbation, but our admiration. This solemn declaration, in the face of an unbelieving age, that the Gospel was the rule, not of people alone, but of kings—this acknowledgment of the Supreme Sovereignty of the Incarnate

* "La Sacra Alleanza del 1815." Quaderno 308, 17 Genaro, 1863.
 "L'Arbitrato Europeo proposto nella lettera di Napoleone III." Quaderno 329. 5 Dicembre, 1863.

Word of God over governors as well as subjects—was an immense step in the direction of the restoration of social order. Here was an open confession that in a return to the principles of Christianity alone would the disorders and disturbances which had convulsed the nations be remedied. Such a confession was an implied repudiation of the Treaty of Westphalia, which, as having sanctioned, under Protestant influences, the opposite principle, had been reprobated by the Holy See, to the great scorn of politicians, whose aim was the entire secularization of European diplomacy. It was tantamount to a declaration that the legal and international atheism inaugurated by that treaty was at once a moral absurdity, a political crime, and a general misfortune. Such a declaration, therefore, contained a tacit approval of the previous sentence of the Holy See.

But if the motive and aim were laudable, what is to be said of the wisdom of the scheme, and of the means for carrying it out which were contemplated by the three potentates? Every Catholic must perceive at once that the predominance of heterodoxy both rendered it impossible for these sovereigns to form a just idea of that which they desired to restore, and was at the same time sure to lead them to establish in its place the despotism of force,—the invariable consequence of the triumph of Protestant rationalism. And as regards the falsity of the conception decorated with the name of Christianity, we have but to consider the three *dramatis personæ* in order to understand the value of the declaration. The head of the Greek schism, the institutor of Evangelical Protestantism, and the heir of the Holy Roman Catholic Empire engage solemnly to take the religion of Christ as the rule and pattern of their political relations! But, in heaven's name, what religion was intended? That of the Holy Synod of St. Petersburg, the Consistory of Berlin, or the Roman Pontiff? Where was the directing authority to reside? Truly, the spirit was religious, but the intellect was blind; and the three good kings knew neither what they meant, nor what they would or could do. And, in fine, referring to the declaration itself, we find that, while proclaiming the determination to give the utmost importance to Evangelical truths, there is no special mention of anything save a benevolent interchange of services, and union in a true and indissoluble fraternity. But what fraternity? The Church has proclaimed fraternity and practised it too, while she has excommunicated and cast out heretics. Fraternity! yelled the Jacobins from the guillotine. Fraternity! shouted the generals at the head of the devastating armies of the Republic. Which, forsooth, of these fraternities did the monarchs mean?—for the first necessary condition in a contract is that its meaning should be clear. The only possible construction to be put upon it is, that the three sovereigns agreed to tolerate their mutual differences, and aid each other fraternally in obliging their subjects to treat with reverence the Gospels of their respective Majesties. It was, in fact, pure naturalism which was established as a political rule, of which the symbol is to do good to all, to believe nothing, and to dispute about nothing. Under this aspect the Holy Alliance was the complement of the Protestant cycle nationally, as philanthropy is its complement in respect to individuals. It was the result of sheer despair, and of weariness at a long contest about dogma, to which none held with a firm faith, a contest in which

no party could succeed in gaining a triumph. Unable to secure peace by the unity of faith, the monarchs really lowered their aim to the unity of tolerance and philanthropy; and so, although desiring, as we freely grant, to establish "the reign of our Divine Saviour Jesus Christ, the Word of Life," they were really establishing the reign of human reason, the sole possible interpreter of this eclectic Christianity.

We need scarcely add, that to the falseness of the idea corresponded the impotence of the execution. The Holy Alliance of the three kings, and, ultimately, of five, was sterile, of course, of all results on consciences; and no alternative remained but that of abandoning the plan, or preserving the peace they desired at the point of their bayonets. This, accordingly, was the course pursued. The five Powers kept guard, the little Powers kept still and held their tongues: and when it proved impossible to preserve concord even among the five potentates themselves, "the reign of the Word of Life" came to be a reign of the majority of the great Powers,—a sort of parliamentary régime in a select council of kings. We know well what motive forces are usually set at work to obtain majorities, in bodies large or small, and what is the mainspring of their action; self-interest is their governing principle: and so international society came to be ruled, or rather to be dictated to, in the name of the Gospel by self-interest, the supreme arbitrator of all societies which have succeeded in expelling Catholic influences. A result quite foreign to the minds of the originators was thus the ultimate issue of the plan—the proved impossibility of a common conscience, and the virtual despotism of a crowned majority.

The Holy Alliance, however, bearing at once the stamp of the personal good intention of the high contracting powers, and the burden of their speculative error, caused for many years an oscillation in the direction of European affairs; now tending to the preservation of order, now preparing new disorders, according to the predominance of the principle of authority and justice, or that of independence and so-called philanthropy. Such was the spirit of the Restoration and the *juste milieu*, as it was called. Threatening dangers from demagogic independence threw men back for a time, through the instinct of self-preservation, upon the sacred rules of justice, rendering them deaf to the soft allurements of a false philanthropy. The danger past, the false principles resumed their sway. This period was naturally one of compromise, and, under its influences, was formed the *doctrinaire* school, which our writers stigmatize as the scourge of the world, inasmuch as by its palliatives and half-measures it opened the floodgate to the revolutionary torrent, and this by the co-operation frequently of well-intentioned or, at least, not ill-intentioned persons. This spirit of compromise and expediency invaded every sphere of society, and completed the extinction in the people of all reverence for right, and in rulers of all fidelity to treaties. Henceforth, there could be no security save in the maintenance during peace of a strong military force. Such has proved to be the upshot of the Holy Alliance, in spite of all the generous desire of the three sovereigns to restore society by the aid of Gospel truth. The error is patent: recourse was had to the Gospel without the interpretation of the Church's infallible authority, and abandoned to the caprice of private opinion. Three heads differing in faith

could only produce an heterogeneous amalgam, incapable of giving any unity of basis to the social edifice which it was their wish to rear.

It will not be expected, after the view here taken, that our writers could have entertained any sanguine hopes as to the results to be obtained from the congress proposed by the Emperor Napoleon. There is no vestige in Europe at the present day of any Christian government, with the exception of the little principality of the Roman Pontiff, the object of the impotent frenzy and insidious plots of the men who desire to despoil him of the little that remains to him. The rest are all either at the mercy of the revolutionary societies, or profess to have nothing to say, in so far as they are governments, to Christ and His Church. It is true that, along with this irreligious state of things, political and social, there has been a wonderful increase of piety, attachment to the Holy See, and active Christian charity; we are witnesses of these consoling facts as respects individual life in the Catholic body; but the governments take no part in this work, except it be to obstruct and oppose it. What subjects have gained by the unchristianizing of the ruling powers we shall not stop to inquire; but the effects upon international relations have been a chronic state of disturbance, confusion, and disquiet, of which no one can guess the end. Everywhere discontent, rancour, jealousies, apprehensions, complaints are rife. In one point all agree: things cannot remain as they are; peace, so far as it is maintained, is owing more to the general dread of going to war under present circumstances than to any other cause. Men meanwhile look eagerly for some solution of pressing difficulties, some escape from a condition of great present evil and threatenings of worse. At this crisis Napoleon proposes a general congress of the powers to reconstitute a new pacific Europe, based on the principles of an enlightened civilization and of progress. Our writers are free to confess that the idea is in itself noble, grand, and philanthropic; they are willing to give the French Emperor all credit for his design, and none the less because it is not quite new, seeing that the first Napoleon, as his nephew has himself detailed, entertained a similar idea of a European confederation. There was this notable difference, however, in the probability—not to say possibility—of its realization, that the uncle at that time virtually held in his iron grasp the dominion of almost the whole continent of Europe, which the nephew certainly does not, and which, moreover, is not the object of his aims. That innumerable difficulties are felt to attend the execution of this scheme, is evident, if only from the answers given by the great powers, specially England and Austria. These answers regard, it is true, the greater or less practicability of the expedient rather than the intrinsic merits of the proposition. But the general opinion may thus be briefly summed up:—that in the present state, both material and moral, of Europe, to effect a pacific arbitration is almost impossible; but that, supposing it were accomplished, things would immediately relapse into a state of worse confusion than ever.

It is not that the Powers, great and small, are not desirous of composing the differences which distract Europe without having recourse to the disastrous extremity of war: they accept the congress in theory; but the congress, unfortunately, has to pass into the region of *facts*, and in the region of facts, so far from the Powers being agreed amongst themselves,

each Power has a view of its own. England has its view, and Russia has its view, and Austria has its view; and so have all the other states, down to the smallest. Who knows but that the little republic of San Marino, or the principality of Monaco, may have its own view too? No matter how microscopic a state may be, it may have, and probably has, its own particular notions as to the way in which matters might be best accommodated. Now what grounds have we to expect that each of the Powers shall be ready to renounce its own scheme and agree in another, which, it may naturally be presumed, is that of France. Any state that feels itself as strong as France will never allow France to dictate the law to Europe under the name of arbitration; and the lesser Powers, who cannot expect to have their respective ideas adopted as a whole, will seek, by grouping themselves around the greater Powers, and throwing their weight prudentially into the scale, to secure a certain proportion of the coveted advantages.

International agreements by means of arbitration are *never* easy; but, to be possible, one or other of two conditions must be presupposed—the great predominance of one state over all the rest, or a public recognized law, such as Europe did once possess at the time when men were Christians, not individually alone, but in their civil organization. The difficulty was further diminished, when there was a recognized interpreter of that law in the Vicar of Christ, an authority invested with these two most august characters, sacredness and paternity, to which all could bow, not merely without loss of dignity, but even with honour. Christendom, albeit often torn by bloody quarrels in the middle ages, was not seldom composed and tranquillized by the Vicar of Him who came to bring peace on earth. But, setting aside this mode of arbitration, which is, perhaps, the only mode which the great ones of the earth can accept without compromise of dignity, the existence of a public rule of right, universally received, is at any rate essential in any attempted arbitration, though not of itself sufficient to remove the difficulties of the case. Accordingly, we do not find any example, subsequent to the middle ages, of a general settlement of Europe in time of peace, arising from the desire of preventing impending war; for this simple reason, that each state, having its own view, which, of course, it persuades itself is the most conformable to right, is unwilling to sacrifice its preferences until it has tried the eventualities of war; provided always it be strong enough to contend single-handed, or able to fortify itself by alliance with others. Philanthropy has small chance of making itself heard. The only case in which such agreements are feasible, is when one or more of the parties interested have been humiliated and enfeebled by a previous contest: we have examples of treaties thus concluded. The peace of Munster, with its famous Treaty of Westphalia, came after the terrible Thirty Years' War; the Treaty of Utrecht, after Louis XIV.'s obstinate contest with Europe; the peace of the Pyrenees was concluded under similar circumstances; and finally, the Treaty of Vienna in 1815 was so comprehensive in its settlement, and so successful in its prolonged results, simply because the conflagration of war had extended so widely, and had produced such a general exhaustion and desire for peace.

It is hard to say, then, how one whose sagacity and acquaintance with the spirit of modern times seems an admitted fact, could entertain hopes of an

amicable settlement under quite opposite conditions ; and we are led to suppose that such expectations were grounded on the so-called advanced state of civilization, brought about by modern progress, which renders that possible now which was never accomplished before. Our writers differ *toto celo* from any such opinion. If a successful issue were unattainable when some kind of public recognized law existed, and treaties were esteemed to have a certain value, what can be expected now that there is not a shadow of such law—of none, at least, but what is backed by force—now that by the new doctrine of intervention or non-intervention at will, the strong have acquired the right to do, or allow to be done, with impunity, whatever iniquitous work may please them—now that, by that other no less novel doctrine of the *fait accompli*, everything done is to be considered and treated as *well done* (always supposing the agent be a power whom it is desirable to regard as a friend), and this however brought about, by violence, cunning, or treachery—now that treaties are made no more account of than was the Treaty of Zurich, which was scarcely signed but it became a dead letter ; or than the Treaty of Vienna, of which it has been lately asserted, in so many words, that it has ceased to exist ? Surely, under such circumstances, the proposal of a European arbitration seems little short of a mockery. Whatever provisions might be made by this illustrious tribunal, they could not amount to more than a recognition of certain rights, guaranteed against all opponents, the whole being sworn to and sealed by a solemn treaty. But since modern progress and the new lights of civilization have established that such rights may possess just the same value as those of Pius IX. over the annexed provinces, or those of Francis II. over the kingdom of Naples, it is clear that the entire execution of the treaty will rest with the good pleasure of some great Power, who may intervene or non-intervene at pleasure. It is clear, moreover, that although, say, fifteen or twenty governments may take part in the congress, it is the five great Powers who will really influence its decisions. If these five Powers cannot settle Europe among them, what manner of good will have been effected by the form of summoning the others and collecting their votes ? For nine long months four Powers have been trying to come to an agreement as to some united action for the relief of unhappy Poland, and have hitherto hit on no expedient to attain this end. Now call a dozen or two more Powers into council ; to the Polish question add all the other questions which are bubbling and boiling in the political and diplomatic saucepan—will the matter be easier, and an agreement rendered more probable by having to unite eighteen or twenty more parties in a concordant decision ? In conclusion, be it observed, the peace which by the congress it is proposed to establish, is to be based upon a prudent regard to the general interests—that is, the material interests—of modern Europe. We all know how preponderant is this consideration in the public mind, and how ruinous to prosperity, under the present constitution of the social state, would be a general war, which, apparently, it wants but a spark at this crisis to kindle. Men hold back with consternation from the dread calamity ; and to this, and this alone, are we doubtless indebted for a respite ; but what additional strength would be imparted to this restraining motive by a formal settlement ? Self-interest is a dividing, not a uniting motive ; if it acts to produce tem-

porary union, it is from the overwhelming motive of fear, but of itself it tends to separation ; it does not, like truth and law, form a natural basis for peace, but the reverse. The apple of discord will never be absent where selfish interest forms the connecting bond, and if there is no scramble for the prize, it is because prudence enjoins abstention. Accordingly peace will be maintained so long, and so long only, as self-interest seems to prescribe forbearance. Let that persuasion be shaken in any one of the parties, the balance is destroyed, and the edifice crumbles into dust.

The idea of the congress seems, indeed, likely to remain an idea ; and even the French journal *La France*, a government paper, has hinted as much. Perhaps, after all, it was never meant to pass from the realm of "the ideal," and was an expedient devised to meet another end—to provide an escape from the horns of a dilemma in which the Polish question had placed the French government. *Silence* or *war* : such were the alternatives—the former, repulsive to the dignity of France ; the latter, ruinous to its interests. The proposed congress was a mean between these disagreeable extremes ; and the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, which did not scruple to call it a "coup de théâtre," adds that it has produced its effect.

[Some very able papers have appeared in the *Civiltà Cattolica*, during the last quarter, on the very important and critical subject of Dr. Döllinger and the Munich Congress, to which we propose drawing attention in our next number.]

ONTOLOGISM AT ROME.

Revue Catholique de Louvain, Janvier, 1864.

THE editors of the *Revue Catholique de Louvain* are well known to belong to the Ontologic school of philosophy. It is with pleasure, therefore, that they have seen opinions which it has been attempted to oppugn in the interests of orthodoxy, publicly maintained in the headquarters of Catholicism, and by so learned a person as the Barnabite, P. Vercellone. His adhesion to these views, grounded on the philosophy of S. Augustine, S. Anselm, and S. Bonaventura, is in accordance with the scientific traditions of the Congregation of which he is so distinguished a member ; and he had already defended them in an academic sitting of July 3rd, 1851, in a dissertation entitled "Sulle Istituzioni Filosofiche." He has since read, on August 27th, 1863, before the Academy of the Catholic Religion, in Rome, a paper comprising twenty-eight pages, in which he develops anew the *Philosophic Doctrines* of S. Augustine. It is scarcely necessary to observe that this dissertation is worthy of notice, not merely for its own intrinsic merits, but from the fact of its having been pronounced before the assembled cardinals, bishops, and doctors of the Sapienza—in short, before all that is most illustrious in religious science and most devoted to the Church. Before such an audience, the frank profession of "ideal intuition" at this special moment, when the subject is one of momentous debate, and that without eliciting the slightest expression of disapprobation, is a significant fact. The reviewers are of opinion that it amounts to a complete justi-

fication of the holders of ontologism against those exclusive Aristotelians who would have us believe that ideal intuition—by which is to be understood the abiding and immediate presence of the Divine light in the human intelligence—is nothing more than an exalted vision of the imagination, a rash surmise, or, worse still, a theory identical with the pantheistic doctrine contained in the seven propositions condemned by the Congregation of the Holy Office, in its sentence of September 18th, 1861. In fact, these seven propositions have nothing in common with the old Augustinian doctrine, or the modern *Gerdilian*, as it has been styled, from its eminent supporter.* These theses were aimed, not at Ontologism, but at Pantheism.

The reviewers are, of course, prepared to tolerate with all charity, and speak with all moderation, of any persons who differ from them on this subject, viz., as to the nature of the light which illuminates the human mind. The question is an open one, and likely to remain so for a long time to come. But what they do protest against, is any attempt to affix the brand of heresy upon the doctrine commonly known as Ontologism, or the system of immediate ideas, and the natural direct intuition of all intelligible truth in God.

P. Vercellone introduces his main subject by observing that philosophy in modern times, with rare exceptions, has wandered away from its true mark, and diverted science from the right road. Philosophy and religion are inseparably united and mutually serve each other. Were it otherwise—were the aim of philosophy independent of, and its province altogether different from, that of theology—should we have seen the great doctors of the Church, S. Augustine, S. Anselm, S. Thomas, pursuing those high metaphysical speculations which have immortalized their names? P. Vercellone hopes that the time is come for giving up profitless disputations, and for taking up the thread of sound traditions, and thereby arriving at the restoration of a true Catholic philosophy and the destruction of the pernicious errors of the day.

Whoever studies the opinions of the Holy Fathers of the Church upon the system of Plato, and that of the most eminent scholastics upon that of Aristotle, will clearly perceive that the Platonism and Aristotelianism of pagan antiquity are by no means represented by the ontologism and psychologism maintained by the leaders of Christian schools. The war between the Academy and the Lyceum has vanished before the light of Catholic thought. The Plato of the Holy Fathers does not disdain the psychologism of S. Thomas, and the Aristotle of the theologians of the middle ages is not opposed to the ontologism of S. Augustine.

It can scarcely be questioned that S. Augustine held opinions characterized in modern times as ontologistic. S. Thomas, S. Anselm, S. Bonaventura, all establish this fact; and two French Oratorians of the seventeenth century, Thomassin and Martin, have superabundantly demonstrated the same. To use an expression of Thomassin's, S. Augustine stands at the head of those patricians of thought who have drawn their inspirations from Plato. And

* See the *Revue Catholique* of January, 1862, where this assertion is ably proved by Professor Ubaghs.

S. Augustine himself has assigned his reasons for his preference of Plato's philosophy over all other systems of pagan times, in its nearer approach, notwithstanding many grievous errors, to Christian teaching with reference to God. Plato divides philosophy into three parts,—physical or natural, logical or rational, and ethical or moral; and in each of these departments he meets with the One True God. To him, in short, the object of all philosophic science is that which is—τὸ Ὀν—that which is ever the same, immutable, eternal. Plato perceives that in God is the cause of existence, the reason of knowledge, and the order of action,—*causa subsistendi, et ratio intelligendi, et ordo vivendi*; in other words, that God is the Supreme Author of created things, the light by which we understand, and the end of our actions. S. Augustine, therefore, prefers the Platonicians, because they alone have recognized God as the principle of the universe, the light of truth, and the source of happiness; and moreover, because they distinguish that which the intelligence discovers from that which the external senses perceive: subtracting nothing from their natural power, but according them nothing beyond. It is on these grounds that he coincides with the Platonicians, especially in their celebrated theory of rational ideas; with them he says, *lumen mentium esse ad discenda omnia eundem ipsum Deum, a quo facta sunt omnia*. Only he penetrates further than the Platonicians in the elucidation of this doctrine, defining it where vague, completing it where defective, and correcting it where it contradicts faith, as S. Thomas observes. S. Augustine, then, holding that God is the sole light of the understanding, even as He is the sole principle of creation, considers that to deny to created intelligences this Divine light of the Creator, is to deny the existence of rational intelligence: just as to deny substance is to destroy the principle of creation.

S. Thomas, as is well known, is no friend to the Platonic system of philosophy. He interprets Plato's ideas conformably to the sense attributed to them by his adversaries, and by Aristotle in particular, and in this form refutes them. Nevertheless, as P. Vercellone points out, he frequently asserts that he has nothing to object to the ideology of S. Augustine. The learned father considers, therefore, that it is far from difficult to reconcile, in the main points, the Platonic-Augustinian and the Aristotelio-Thomastic traditions. The Angel of the school, in fact, expressly teaches that the fundamental truths of science exist eternally in the Divine intelligence, and that all intelligible truth is identical with the Infinite Being. As many persons imagine that S. Thomas absolutely rejects all ideal vision, it may not be superfluous to adduce proofs from his works. The reviewers have selected some passages not quoted by P. Vercellone. Our space forbids transcription beyond a few words from the first specimen:—"The reasonable creature enjoys two privileges. The first is, that it sees in the light of God. In this increased light the animals have no share; but the reasonable creature participates therein in the natural knowledge it has of truth. . . . By the physical light we know objects as visible; by the spiritual light we know things as true. '*Rationalis creatura videt in lumine Dei . . . in lumine scilicet quo tu (Deus) lucet.*'" (Expos. in Ps. xxxv.)

P. Vercellone traces the origin of the deplorable difference which has

arisen between two schools, equally Catholic, on the subject of the ideas of the reason ; and he ascribes it to a return to the old pagan dispute between the ideology of Plato and that of Aristotle, coupled with a forgetfulness and neglect of the two great Christian doctors. Both having the same object, that of upholding the great principle of creation, and maintaining the distinction between the Creator and the creature, S. Augustine and S. Thomas placed themselves at opposite points of view ; whence it comes, in a great measure, that ontologists and psychologists have often believed that their adversaries misunderstood or incorrectly defined the philosophic doctrines which they really hold in common. P. Vercellone is of opinion that the two schools differ much more in expression than in substance, and that a reconciliation, as it is most desirable, so also is it far from impossible. Between S. Augustine and S. Thomas there never was any real disagreement in the matter of ideology, but only diversity of method, exposition, and language. Divine Providence willed that Catholic doctrine should twice restore philosophy, starting, however, from opposite points ; proceeding, in the first instance, from the understanding to the senses, and, in the second, from the senses to the understanding. But to arrive at concord, the present arbitrary exclusiveness must be abandoned. The ontologists, on their side, must concede the creature its share, and leave to the senses their natural power (*non adimenter sensibus id quod possunt*) ; and the psychologists, on their side, must be more careful to allow for the intelligibility of things, and not transfer to the senses a power which they do not possess (*non dantes sensibus ultra id quod possunt*). Then each may make his choice between opposite methods, and in the question concerning the divine light which illuminates the soul, may indifferently adhere either to the primitive formula of Catholic Ontologism in S. Augustine, or to the imitative exposition of Catholic Psychologism in S. Thomas.

The reviewers, while rejoicing, as ontologists, in the practical sanction which their philosophy has received, applaud the calm and conciliating spirit of the learned Barnabite. The *urbanità Romana*, they consider, contrasts favourably with the *furia Francese* in this matter. We earnestly hope that the envenomed discussion between psychologists and ontologists, which has so long divided zealous Catholics on the other side the Channel, but in which we desire to take no formal part, may find a happy conclusion in the manner indicated ; and we are confident that the first step towards so desirable a result must be a sincere and patient attempt to understand each other, and an abstention from all endeavours to fix upon the contrary party a meaning which it repudiates. We have had too much experience of the opposite course. Half the time, paper, and mental labour expended is in self-justification, a task which the temper, candour, and charity of opponents ought to render unnecessary.

Our reviewers conclude with a passage from a letter of the Archbishop of Tours to Mgr. de Nantes, which we cordially endorse :—" We are not of the number of those who insist, perforce, on proving themselves in the right : our sole desire is to know the true doctrine, that we may cleave to it. Amicus Plato, magis amica veritas."

APPENDIX TO ARTICLE I.—"THE UNION MOVEMENT.

THE March number of the *Union Review* reaches us so late that we are able to bestow but a very few words upon a communicated article which it contains from the pen of Mr. de Lisle. We regret this, however, the less, because we cannot say that he has changed the opinions deliberately expressed in our article upon the merits of the movement which he advocates.

Mr. de Lisle indeed says that he and his friends have no intention of hindering individual conversions. We never should have thought for a moment of imputing to a Catholic like himself, or those who agree with him, an intention at once so un-Catholic, so presumptuous, and so absurd; but we think, nevertheless (and this Mr. de Lisle almost or altogether admits), that the project of corporate reunion has a tendency to discourage the submission of individuals to the Church.

In other respects Mr. de Lisle's article leaves us nothing to do, but simply to recapitulate what we have said in our own. He confirms by his language, instead of removing, the objections we feel against the movement, as undogmatic in principle and nationalistic in spirit; and we are shocked to say that he even seems to think it possible—we sincerely hope we misunderstand him—that the question of clerical celibacy might be practically re-opened here in England. Not one of the least remarkable features in Mr. de Lisle's theory of union, is that which points out the man who is to be the providential instrument in effecting it. We confess to having experienced a sensation of amazement amounting almost to a shock, upon arriving at this solution of the enigma, in which, by the joint aid of historical precedents and prophetic anticipations, Mr. de Lisle had succeeded in engaging our interest. We said to ourselves, "Who can it be?" We thought of the Emperor of Russia, the Emperor of Austria, and at last settled upon the Prince of Wales: when, to our unspeakable astonishment, we learned that the "man of the situation" was no other than—the Emperor Napoleon the Third! Such wild extravagance is the most significant comment that can be made on the practical and common-sense character of Mr. de Lisle's anticipations. Heartily do we wish that so zealous a Catholic, and one who has displayed again and again such noble munificence in the promotion of God's glory, could be cured of the strange delusion under which he labours, that that glory can be advanced by the fundamentally anti-Catholic movement which he regards with a sympathy so unintelligible and amazing.

Foreign Events of Catholic Interest.

ROME.—On the festival of the Chair of S. Peter, an address from laymen of various countries, to the number of 200, who happened at the time to be at Rome, was presented to the Pope. The document was drawn up by M. Hilaire Mercier de Lacombe, an eminent French Catholic writer, and was presented to his Holiness by Lord Campden and Duke Scotti of Milan. France, England, Germany, Spain, Portugal, Poland, Mexico, the Argentine Republic, and the United States of America, as well as Milan, Naples, and Genoa, were represented on this occasion. The address, emanating from Catholics of all nations met together in the capital of Christendom, expressed the deepest veneration and the most faithful devotion to the Holy Father, coupled with the hope that the claims of justice and of right, so long disregarded, might soon be satisfied, in the complete re-establishment of his temporal power. The subscribers declared that at this day, more perhaps than ever, under the memorable pontificate of Pius IX., the Eternal City appeared as the Universal City; that everything done at Rome was done for the city and the world. They looked upon the institutions of Rome, the seminaries of all nations, the hospitals, schools, and colleges, the unmatched institution of the Propaganda, together with the venerated Catacombs and majestic Basilicas, not only as the glory of Rome and of the Pope, but as the treasure and patrimony of Christendom. They declared also that the revival of Peter's pence, which had originated in the free charity of the faithful, was, in their eyes, rather a debt of conscience, and a sacred obligation on all Catholics. After paying a tribute of respect to the Papal army of volunteers from all countries—small in its numbers, but great by the memory of Castelfidardo—they concluded with the following words:—"Holy Father, with these feelings of veneration for your person, of admiration for your courage and for your virtues, of absolute devotion to your cause, of calm and unshaken confidence in the triumph promised by Providence to your right, we prostrate ourselves at your feet, and implore from your Holiness your paternal blessing upon us, upon our families, and upon our respective countries." The Holy Father's reply was in substance as follows:—"The words of tender affection which you have just uttered, my dear children, and which give my poor heart new strength to maintain unto the end right, justice, and truth, are only the echo of all that the Church, the Pope, Religion itself, have taught the world. They are the echo of that voice of truth and justice which the Apostles and their successors have uplifted in all ages, in all times, and especially in the time in which we live. The Apostle S. Peter (as S. Lawrence said) showed by coming to Rome a greater and a more courageous faith than when he walked upon the sea; greater because he was entering a city which was then nothing but a wilderness of savage and untamable wild beasts. But little by little, while listening to the voice of the Apostle of Jesus Christ, those wild beasts became gentle and obedient lambs. Before an hour had passed, S. Peter had sent S. Brice into Umbria and S. Apollinaris into the Romagna. The inhabitants of those countries were then living in barbarism and paganism. I do not know if it was in the designs of God to give those provinces to the Church as a patrimony, but I do know that the Church now possesses them;

that they are only held by the Pope in trust; and what I know, above all, is that I will never consent to any surrender, nor to any disgraceful compromise. I conclude, my dear children, by giving you my Apostolic blessing. But I wish still to say, that if I desire to keep these provinces, it is not in order to be a king. No, I keep them because it is a matter of necessity, in the ecclesiastical order, for the Church to keep that which Providence has given to her. My ambition as Pope is to be the worthy successor of the Apostles; to keep alive in the nations the spirit of faith and charity; to teach obedience to the peoples, and to princes respect for justice and for right. This is why the Pope is concerned to keep his kingdom; and until the end I will speak aloud this word of justice and of truth. My most dear children, let us listen to the voice of the Apostles of Jesus Christ. May God bless you all, and altogether and always, make you live in a Christian manner, and grant you all possible happiness in this vale of misery!" At another recent audience the Pope declared that, happen what might, he would never leave Rome. This unalterable determination on the part of his Holiness, and his calm confidence in the eventual triumph of justice, have restored courage to the desponding, and raised the hopes of the Catholic world. From all parts of Christendom, from America and Australia, as well as from oppressed Italy, addresses of loyalty to the Supreme Head of the Church, accompanied by expressions of attachment and devotion to his sacred person, have been laid at the feet of Pius IX. As a protest in the language which the world so well understands, against the spoliation of the Patrimony of S. Peter, and as a tribute to the Pope, Peter's pence to the amount of 35,480,000 francs have, up to the 31st of December, 1863, been sent to Rome. In this amount are not reckoned jewels and works of art of great value, which are being continually forwarded. The popularity of Pius IX. in Rome itself is admitted, even by those who, were it not so indisputable, would be only too glad to deny a fact so unfavourable to the plans of the enemies of the Church; and all the efforts made by the Piedmontese party to create disturbance have failed. Besides ordering the people to abstain from the rejoicings of the Carnival, and sending anonymous letters to all visitors, bidding them beware of taking part therein, the agents of Turin have, for the second time, affixed a list of proscriptions to the walls of the city. This list contains the names of most respectable persons, men and women, both among the nobility and the citizens generally, who are described in terms borrowed from the lowest vocabulary of the fish-market or the galleys. Their crime in the eyes of the "Sect" was that they chose to rejoice in the time of the Carnival, and to treat with merited contempt the threats of the secret plotters of the Revolution. Not content, however, with threats, the agents of one of the secret societies let off a bomb before Spithöver's library, in the Piazza di Spagna. The front of the shop was blown out, but fortunately nobody was killed. M. Spithöver is very well known for his devotion to the Papal cause, and for his zeal as a collector of Peter's pence: hence the implacable hatred of which he is the object. The Piedmontese party disclaim all connection with this cowardly attack, and lay the crime on the party of action, the accomplices of Garibaldi and Mazzini. Whatever this disclaimer be worth, it is well known in Rome that many individuals belong to both societies; and it is evident that, however much the National Committee may now repudiate disorder and bloodshed, they rejoice at disturbances created by their bolder brethren. The frequent attempts of the Piedmontese party to excite, if they cannot intimidate, the popular mind, are becoming absurd in the extreme. They have issued anonymous circulars, bidding all strangers to quit Rome before the 15th of March. By such means they hope to create a feeling of insecurity, which may contribute, in its degree, to the success of their plans.

Complaints are made that the authorities do not prosecute these disturbers

of public order with sufficient severity; but the patience of the Papal Government, under the most extraordinary provocations, may be said to be unexampled in Europe. Were it to imitate the example of Sardinia in its treatment of the Neapolitans and Sicilians, whose chief crime is an inveterate hatred against the invaders of their country and the spoliators of their Church, the political prisons of Rome would be filled with the agents of Mazzini and Garibaldi, and of the Piedmontese Government itself. As it is, the political prisons of Rome are almost empty. In his account of a visit to the prisons of Italy, Mr. Cochrane, the member for Honiton, mentions that the political prisoners of Rome are confined in the *Carceri Nuovi* and in the *San Michele*. In the first, he says, there are thirty-three persons confined in rooms separate from the other prisoners. They had undergone a preliminary investigation, but had not yet received their sentences. The prison of *San Michele*, he continues, is appropriated to persons convicted of political offences. In this prison there are one hundred and twenty prisoners, eighteen of whom were guilty of simple conspiracy, as members of secret societies. But in the greater number of instances political offences simply mean assassination, arson, and other crimes of a violent character. During the night the prisoners are shut up in separate cells, which open on to a spacious and airy corridor. Around these cells are galleries from which you descend to the hall, where the prisoners are allowed to meet and amuse themselves at their pleasure during the daytime. In general, they are not refused books, and the greater number of these prisoners seem perfectly satisfied with their treatment. Here also there are no irons; the treatment is mild, and it is a marvellous thing to see how the warders maintain discipline by moral force alone. The regulations for the purchase of provisions, tobacco, &c. (continues this writer, the substance of whose report we are giving), are the same in this prison as in the *Carceri Nuovi*; but the prisoners are not allowed to receive more frequent visits from their friends than those in the last-mentioned place of detention. Many are placed in a separate quarter. This, however, is an exception, proceeding from a kind regard to their rank and social position, and intended to save them from intercourse with ordinary malefactors.

It will not be out of place to quote here, in as condensed a manner as we can, the general impression which Mr. Cochrane derived from his visit to the Roman prisons. "The impression produced on my mind," he says, "by an investigation of the principal prisons (the *Carceri Nuovi*, the *Termini*, and the *San Michele*), is that the condition of the prisoners leaves but little to be desired. Those in whose minds the name of 'Roman prisons' awakens the idea of damp and unwholesome dungeons, of oppression managed by all sorts of cruel means, will be surprised to learn that irons are unknown in them, that food is plentiful and of good quality, that it is by no means prohibited to read books, that the prisoners are not debarred from seeing their friends from time to time, that they are allowed to smoke at all hours of the day, and that there is even a shop in each prison, in which eatables are sold at very reasonable prices. The inmates of the *Carceri Nuovi* are distributed in different quarters by forties and fifties, and each individual has a double mattress and a blanket. It has, however, been remarked as a defect, that the convicts are not subjected to any kind of labour. The work of the establishment is divided among a certain number who are destined for that purpose; and these are far happier than the others, who have no compulsory occupation during the whole day. Once a month each prisoner can appear before a council, composed of the Governor of Rome and three of the other principal authorities, to whom he can freely complain; while another council is deputed by the Holy Father, three times a year, to distribute pardons, some free, some conditional. The convict is allowed to see his friends in a private room, a privilege which is allowed to those who are still on their trial only in the presence of a warder.

Compare these prisons with those of England. In all we find the same defect which exists in those of the rest of Italy—want of cleanliness. All the prisoners of their own accord expressed themselves generally well satisfied with the treatment which they met with. The Termini prison, which is situated near the Baths of Dioclesian, in a fine and airy situation, is divided into two compartments—one for the men, the other for the women. This latter *is admirable in every respect*—commodious, orderly, and clean throughout. It is under the direction of sixteen foreign sisters. The inmates of all classes, one hundred and eighty in number, assemble in the same room during the day and observe strict silence. They are, however, allowed at certain hours to relieve the monotony of their daily toil by singing. The Superioress sits upon a platform at the extremity of the hall, where she sees everything that goes on, and keeps the prisoners in order. But the discipline, although strict, is mitigated by every consideration due to these unfortunate creatures. The dormitories are the perfection of cleanliness. The bedclothes are of white linen, and the unflinching kindness of the sisters leaves nothing to be desired."

Contrast these prisons of Rome, and especially the state of political prisons, not only with those of Naples, described by Lord H. Lennox last year, but still more with the prisons in the provinces, such as those of Cosenza, of Potenza, and of Catanzaro, where the prisoners are crowded together without even straw to lie upon, and without covering; and where, as in the last-named of these cities, 224 prisoners were attacked with typhus owing to the state of the prison. Contrast the political prisoners of Rome with the prisoners at Foggia, thrust, for want of room, into houses of wood, close and infected; or with the prisons of Avellino, filled by old men, women, and children, helplessly cowering on the floor, cast into prison only because their sons, their husbands, or their fathers, were fighting among the insurgents. Contrast, again, the political prisons of Rome, as described by a member of our own House of Commons, with the fort at Brindisi, gorged with prisoners of a respectable condition in life, who are shut in between walls which are described by the Marquis Ulloa as sweating with dampness and death; where such as are considered dangerous are bound to stakes and beaten by the gaolers or National Guards, in spite of their heart-rending cries; or, finally, with that at Nisida, where a man was chained hand and foot to the grating of a window. Contrast with the condition of the prisoners of Rome those wretched victims of Piedmontese tyranny, yellow and emaciated, breathing a dense atmosphere of stench and foulness, such as might at any moment bring down a pestilence on their judges, but at the same time poison an innocent city. Beyond this contrast, all comment on Neapolitan prisons is superfluous. Writing of Lord H. Lennox and the prisons which he had not visited in the provinces, the Marquis Ulloa said, "At the sight of such sufferings as are unknown in the middle passage, he would have cried out that on the soil of Naples, once the Eden of Italy, there was now something worse than the *Inferno* of Dante."

The relations between the French General and the Pontifical Government are far from being of a satisfactory character. The hostile proceedings of General de Goyon were often prompted by vanity and self-love, but General de Montebello's conduct is the result of that studied contempt which a certain class of military men in France think fit to display towards the Catholic priesthood. It is this contemptuous neglect of what is due to the Pontifical Government that lies at the bottom of most of the disputes which have arisen of late. De Mérode is quick in resenting acts of such a character, and in pointing out to the French authorities the necessity of uniting with their military duties a respect for the sovereign authority of the Pope, the remains of which it is their business to protect. The menace which Napoleon was so often wont to make of withdrawing from Rome, in order to force the Pope to

come to a compromise with the Revolution, is too stale to be repeated now. The Pope knew well that Napoleon never intended to leave Rome, but rather aimed at gaining a firm hold in Italy, in order to be ready in case of war, or of the break-up of the present state of things in the South, to occupy at once Naples as well as Rome. It is also clear that the French army is at Rome, not so much to re-establish the Papal power, as to act as an advanced guard of the Revolution. In all the acts of this army of occupation there has been an unmistakable partiality shown towards the enemies of the Holy See, and a desire to curtail the exercise of the Papal sovereignty. Some such idea prompted M. de Morney, in the recent debates, to put forth as an hypothesis the case of the Pope's renouncing, of his own will, the States of the Church, in order to adopt the propositions of the Emperor. This hypothesis excited a certain sensation in the French legislature; and it was remarked that the idea was but little in keeping with a real desire to preserve the temporal power of the Pope. It is not in the interests of Napoleon that the old order of things should be restored in Italy; but there is no knowing what turn events may take. War with Austria, civil war, exhaustion of the revolutionary passions, the increase of fiscal burdens, the tyranny of the revolutionary committees, the voice of conscience in a Catholic people—each of these motives, or some of them combined, may lead Italy back to the feet of the Pope. "Save us," may be the cry of Italy, "from the Red Republic, from the godless tyranny of the Sects, or from the military yoke of despotic France." In any case, Rome will not have participated in the Revolution, nor have compromised the principles of justice.

In reply to the scarcely respectful remarks with which M. de Lavalette urged the Pope to make a compromise with the Revolution in Italy, Pius IX. contented himself with saying, "We shall await events, M. de Lavalette." In the mean time, the Pope in his character, as he himself says, of Bishop of Rome, spoke in the following terms to the preachers appointed to hold the Lenten stations in fifteen churches of the city: "I am not only the Vicar of Jesus Christ, I am also the Bishop of Rome; and I am bound in this character to urge you to work ardently for the sanctification of the Roman people. This people have great faith; they have given me frequent proofs of it; but they have faults. You know that in ancient times a man called the 'Scourge of God' marched against Rome. In the midst of the terror of the people, my predecessor, prompted by the spirit which guides the Pope, appeared before him and succeeded in turning him away from the Eternal City. We have the homily of this Pontiff, who induced the people to betake themselves to prayer, and we know that, after having for a time persevered in the practice of religion, they relapsed into their faults to such a degree that another homily of S. Leo tells us of the approach of Genserik, when none were able to prevent him from laying Rome waste with fire and sword. I am far from expecting an Attila or a Genserik; thank God! the times are changed; but I feel called upon to remind you of this incident, in order to point out how you should gain over this people—by prayer, by preaching, and, above all, by example."

NAPLES.—Numerous loyal addresses from his subjects in the Neapolitan States were presented to King Francis II. in Rome on New-Year's day. Two deputations—one from Naples, the other from Palermo—were appointed to go to Rome for the purpose; but they were expressly forbidden by the order of the king, to undertake so perilous an enterprise. Did they even succeed in reaching their destination in safety, it was but too probable that the Sardinian Government would prevent their return. On the occasion of his name's-day, a large number of addresses, expressive of fidelity and attachment, were presented from the most opposite parts of Naples and Sicily. To these addresses are appended 56,000 names. One of them is from the National Guards of Naples, who declare that during four years of grievous trial and humiliation

they have not ceased to turn their eyes towards that holy city, Rome the blessed, which shelters, in the person of their sovereign, their faith, their honour, their liberty, and their happiness. They explain, that though the number of signatures is limited, yet that each name represents a family, and has been appended singly, in secret, at the risk of persecution, of ruin, and even of death. They proclaim their conviction that they represent the immense majority of the citizens of the National Guard of Naples, who never forget that, in the moment of supreme danger, to their patriotism was confided by the king the future of their country. The address concludes by stating that among those who have signed it are to be found the names of many who were led astray by the promises of the Piedmontese, but who have been brought back by four years of suffering and shame to the cause of independence and of the national monarchy. The document is signed by 41 officers, 417 non-commissioned officers, 2,379 guards; making a total of 2,837. Military oppression, increase of taxation, loss of municipal rights, together with the vexatious laws against the Church, help to keep alive in the country the feeling of loyalty. The Piedmontese Government, if they tried, could scarcely do more to provoke the Neapolitan people. What more absurd and, at the same time, what more irritating, than to apply the famous article of the law *Pica* to the sacred images exposed to the veneration of the faithful in the public streets? Yet this absurdity has been committed, and these images are now by a municipal order condemned to a fixed abode (*domicilio coatto*). In answer to the remonstrances of the Vicar-General of the exiled Archbishop, the prefect of Naples replied that he should adopt "such measures as were dictated by the sound principles of religion and politics, and with a tranquil mind as befits a public functionary." The day after their removal the people gathered in crowds, and in some parts of Naples replaced the sacred images in their niches, decorated, as on feast-days, with flowers and lights. In the face of a general disaffection springing from various causes, and always on the alert to make itself felt, the Piedmontese authorities had the folly to attempt again during the Carnival the farce of a public rejoicing. This fruitless attempt is thus described, in a letter from Naples, addressed to the *Mémorial Diplomatique* :—
"A propos of the masquerade, we also, we at Naples, have had three days of official carnival in order to give at least the government press opportunity to speak of Neapolitan gaiety, of the love of this people for the Savoy dynasty, of the constant care which these good princes take of these populations. By a general order, twelve battalions of the national guard occupied the cars in the procession; the cars and horses were furnished by the artillery; the necessary expenses were paid out of the military chest; and the persons who had to take part in the masquerade were drawn by lot. The municipality also fitted out two cars at the expense of the State, and Prince Humbert, as a stroke of policy, occupied a third. This attempt, on the whole, has been taken in bad part; such squandering of public money was thought out of place in the face of the general misery, which cannot be concealed. The press, also, has been nearly unanimous in condemning this masquerade; the people themselves, moreover, turned it into ridicule; the cars returned literally covered with mud. The government had wished to see the workmen of the city take part in the demonstration; but a letter from the president of the Working Men's Society (the same society which refused to take part in the public procession on the occasion of the late visit of the king of Sardinia to Naples) published in several of the journals, cut short all further proceedings in the matter. "If in the next meeting on Wednesday," said the letter, "the Working Men's Society receives any sum of money, it will make use of it in behalf of the unhappy victims of the catastrophe of Petarsa:* thus remaining faithful to its title—a society for mutual succour."

* An allusion to one of the late atrocities of the Piedmontese soldiery.

From the following statistics, which have lately been published, it appears that the state of the Neapolitan prisons is so far from improving, as to claim more than ever the attention, not only of the politician, but of every one who is alive to the sentiment of humanity. In the prison of Potenza, chief town of the Basilicata, there are 4,000 prisoners. The convent of San Luca, the church of San Nicolo, and even the vaults of the latter, as we mentioned in our last summary, are *still* crowded with the victims of the law *Pica*. The prisoners in Salerno and its dependencies are 3,000; those in Naples, 2,000; and in Terra di Lavoro, 2,700; 900 are imprisoned at Nisida; 700 at Pozzuoli; 1,209 at Ancona; and 1,700 at Palermo—all condemned to hard labour or put in irons. In the sixteen provinces no fewer than 40,000 persons are in prison; and this number does not include those condemned to the galleys for "brigandage" (which means a state of acute disaffection against the Piedmontese usurpation) and for military offences, who exceed 32,000; in all, making 72,000 prisoners for the crime of loyalty to their legitimate sovereign, and dissatisfaction with the oppressors of their Church's privileges. To this account we have only to add that, in the prisons of Foggia, owing to the number of prisoners crowded within their walls and to their neglected condition, typhus fever has again broken out, and in a short time has assumed an alarming character. It is stated that, thanks to the measures taken by the authorities, the fever is now abating; but the outbreak of the disease might have been easily prevented had the authorities only paid common attention to the salubrity of the prisons, and not thrust a hundred persons into localities scarcely calculated to hold half that number. In addition to the evil of overcrowding, the ventilation is obstructed by the gratings which block up the windows.

But not content with filling the prisons, and killing, by slow death, those who had escaped their merciless fusillations, the Turinese Government is now setting resolutely to work to root up the free institutions of the country. The municipality of Naples is about to be dissolved, and an exceptional administration installed in its stead. The greater number, indeed, of the municipalities of Southern Italy are now under this new system. The statistics (says the *Borsa* of Naples) of the municipal councils dissolved—and some of them three times over within these last few years—would show how wide of popular choice is the Government which, in annulling municipal elections, puts in force an exceptional right with which the law has armed it, and then elevates it into a general rule. And this is alleged to be done for the sake of concord, and in deference to public opinion—the new formula which, taking universal suffrage for its basis, is made the justification for all these irregularities. Ever since the last municipal elections, which were unfavourable to the Government, the dissolution of the chief Italian municipality was spoken of as probable. It is now decided upon. Such a decision shows what little respect the Piedmontese Government has for municipal independence. In recognition of the signal services which he has rendered to Government as Syndic of Naples, Signor Colonna is to be nominated royal commissioner. Such a settlement (says the Neapolitan journal from which we quoted above) may be very satisfactory to the Government and to the Syndic of Naples, but not so to the country. The reason alleged at Turin for the dissolution of the municipality of Naples is the bankrupt state of the municipal treasury. That such would be the result was to be foreseen from the moment that the municipal authorities lent themselves to the political schemes of the Government, and got up, on various occasions, political manifestations in aid of the attempt to make the usurping power appear popular in the country. We have dwelt specially on this last act of the Piedmontese Government, as it shows that, as the lives of the disaffected Neapolitans are not safe from the fusilladings of a merciless soldiery, so their fundamental liberties are endangered by the tyranny of the power

which has obtruded itself upon the country. Sardinia may gather up her army, three or four hundred thousand strong, may send her rifled guns to the frontier in expectation of the coming struggle which the revolutionary committees have fixed for the present spring; but, instead of the accession of territory which she desires, in the possession of Venice and Rome, the first shock of a European war may shatter to pieces the ill-assorted and disjointed collection of States which is called the kingdom of Italy.

SARDINIA.—The Piedmontese Government still persist in their persecutions against the Church. Bishops and priests, monks and nuns, are imprisoned, robbed, and driven out upon the world to starvation or beggary. The *Armonia*, the *Unità Cattolica*, and *Stendardo Cattolico* have opened subscription lists for such nuns as, owing to the non-payment of the paltry pension of from 150 to 600 francs allotted to them by the Government, are now in a state of the greatest destitution. It is needless to enter into details, but we may mention that in Naples alone twenty convents have been suppressed; in Perugia, upwards of forty; and in Assisi, it is said, no fewer than twenty-seven. In Sicily there are 9,000 monks whose property has been confiscated, and 2,000 nuns who have been driven out of their convents. But these suppressions are only the beginning of the work of spoliation. The Turinese Government does not do its work by halves. It is proposed not only to confiscate their property, but to abolish monastic orders altogether in Italy. In the statistical account appended to the bill relating to the confiscation of Church property and the suppression of the monastic orders, lately brought before the Turinese Parliament, it is stated that in the different countries of Italy there are 84 religious orders, 1,724 monasteries of non-mendicant monks, and 658 of mendicants. The non-mendicant orders count 15,494 professed monks, and 18,198 professed nuns; 4,468 lay brothers, and 7,671 lay sisters: making altogether 63,239 members. There are no exact statistics of the secular clergy. Their whole number is divided between 44 archiepiscopal and 185 episcopal sees—in all, 229 ecclesiastical districts.

The total revenue of Church property, including religious corporations, bishoprics, benefices, canonries, exceeds seventy-six millions of francs. But it will be well to examine a little more in detail these figures, about which the Liberal party has raised such an outcry. There are certainly not fewer than 120,000 Churchmen in Italy: now, calculating how much of this revenue of seventy-six millions falls to each ecclesiastic, we find that it does not amount to more than 633 francs per head—under £27 sterling. This is one half less than the French clergy received before 1789. The State, on the plan proposed, is to take possession of the landed property belonging to the Church, and, in return, to charge itself with the payment of the yearly revenue out of the State funds—an ingenious method of paying about half the acknowledged value of the property seized; for the rent of land is generally about 2½ per cent., whilst the Government stock is at the rate of 5 per cent. In addition to this, the Piedmontese funds, instead of being at par, do not exceed seventy. Thus a double robbery is committed: first, in taking possession of the land, and then in retaining two-thirds of the indemnity which has been arbitrarily fixed upon.

It is not only hatred to the Church, or the desire to enrich the treasury and to gratify their revolutionary supporters, which drives the Turinese Cabinet to adopt these violent measures of spoliation. There is a still stronger motive. The State is threatened with national bankruptcy, or, as an alternative, the reduction of expenditure, the disbanding of a large portion of the army, and a return to a peace policy. But there can be no peace where there is no justice. Usurpers must pay the price of their usurpation. Reduction of the army would be loss of the South of Italy, the foregoing of the hopes on Rome

and Venice. Therefore, money must be raised at all costs. The first step is to plunder the religious corporations, the charitable institutions, and the clergy generally; the next is to lay on fresh taxes. A bill is now being introduced to tax landed property on an equal basis in all the Italian provinces. The Minister of Finance declared that the bill was intended to do away with the last traces of territorial and political divisions. The proposed impost is very unpopular; meetings have been held, and petitions drawn up in opposition to it in the various localities which are now to be brought under the grasp of the Piedmontese Finance Minister. Far from doing away with territorial and political divisions, it is likely to excite still more the rancour of races, and increase the aversion with which, in the South of Italy at least, the Piedmontese occupancy is regarded. Increased taxation, with no equivalent except the honour of being governed from Turin, is fatal to the popularity of its authors. The party of action, as well as the royalists and national party, are thoroughly dissatisfied. You may tear up the catechism, but you must not touch the purse, is the maxim of too many. It was only as a last resort against bankruptcy that the Cabinet of Turin was driven to this measure.

Besides the war of spoliation and suppression, the Government never ceases to show its hostility to the Church by its vexatious and arbitrary conduct towards the bishops and clergy. The Archbishop of Urbino was kept under arrest for two months, and was finally discharged on the tribunals of Ancona declaring that there were no grounds at all for instituting a trial. The Archbishop of Milan, Mgr. Caccia, was subject to like iniquitous treatment. He was summoned to appear within twenty-four hours at Turin, and when he remonstrated against such an arbitrary proceeding, as a violation of his personal freedom, and an offence against the dignity of his office, the only answer he received was a visit, at the expiration of the term, from an agent of police, who came to conduct him to Turin. In this manner the lawless power which is seated at Turin tramples down personal liberty, insults the dignity of the Church, and outrages popular feeling. No sooner was the annexation accomplished, says the Marquis Ulloa, in his celebrated letters, than the liberty of the individual existed no more at Naples. Men were imprisoned without accusation, without trial, without warrant of the magistrate. The trade of an informer became an occupation sanctioned by patriotism. The whim of a spy, of a national guard, of a camériste, of the first comer who arrogated to himself the right because he had the power, was sufficient to cause the arrest of men whose sole crime was to have uttered a complaint on the slavery of their country. Speaking of domiciliary visits, the same trustworthy writer says—"From the 1st of January to the end of March, 1862, 1,511 domiciliary visits were made in the city of Naples alone. Men were dragged to prison, and mercilessly ill-treated. Prisoners were heaped together on a cart, monks sometimes were carried off in this manner along with common thieves." In a letter to M. Berryer, dated 11th of August of last year, the Marquis Ulloa declares that the new judges are ignorant and unknown men, whose sole merit is in having conspired against the former Government, or in having been condemned for political offences, and that they are charged, not to judge, but to defend the Government against the people and against party-struggles. The new magistrates, he continues, allow themselves to be surprised every day in a flagrant and criminal forgetfulness of their oaths. Such are the men who, setting themselves every instant above the forms prescribed by the law, and above all rules of justice and morality, boast of having rescued the people of Naples from tyranny.

BELGIUM.—The election at Bruges, on the 19th of January, was the proximate cause of the resignation of the Ministry. It was the greatest moral blow which the Government, under the circumstances, could have received.

In the elections of June, M. Devaux, the father of liberalism, as he was styled, was rejected by the constituency of Bruges, a city which he had represented for thirty years. The Liberals would not submit to such a defeat, and the election was annulled in the Belgian Chambers by a majority of two. The Government had made it a party question, and had brought all their influence to bear—first, to upset the decision of the electors of Bruges, and secondly, to bring in their candidates at the new election. All their organs in the press were at work for months, exhausting every species of vituperation against the “clericals,” as it is their fashion to style in derision the Catholic and Conservative party. For some time past the Liberals had been losing at almost every election; their foremost men were thrown out; the prime minister himself was rejected by three great constituencies, and for a time was unable to obtain a seat in the Chambers. It was necessary for the existence of the Government to obtain, if possible, a signal triumph. No means were neglected, even to the enlisting of the police as electioneering agents. Every agency which despair or unscrupulous partisanship could suggest was employed. But all to no purpose. The Bruges election went against the Government. Three Conservatives were returned by large majorities. The Government resigned, and their resignation was followed by an unprecedentedly long ministerial crisis, as it is called. The Catholic party declined to take office, as long as they had not a parliamentary majority; and as the resignation of the Government was brought about by no parliamentary action on their part, they did not feel called upon in the present state of the country to take upon themselves the responsibility of a dissolution. The Liberal party would not allow the formation of any ministry of a neutral character. They have, however, agreed to carry on the government for a time, but refuse to withdraw their resignation. The Liberals are declining in credit and strength every day, whilst every fresh election brings new strength to the Catholics. The latter are content to abide by the results of the ordinary elections which are to take place next year, and which they conceive will give them a majority in the Chambers sufficient to warrant them in taking the administration into their own hands. Out of this position it is the aim of the Liberal party to force them. Their desire is to promote an immediate dissolution, believing that the turmoil of a general election would be to their advantage. The municipal offices are still filled by their partisans. They have the means at hand to intimidate the electors; we know that they are not wanting in unscrupulous daring. On a lesser emergency they have before this resorted to street riots.

The Catholics of Belgium, it seems to us, are not conscious enough of their own strength. We were ourselves told last year by Belgians, that the reason why Catholics did not exert themselves more than they do in the elections, municipal and parliamentary, was, that they were afraid of provoking the Liberals, and bringing about a revolution, in which the liberties which Catholics now enjoyed would be lost. Fear of a Masonic revolution, and want of confidence in their power to preserve public order and their own liberties, is the principal cause of Catholic defeat and Liberal triumph. Freemasonry, it is true, is a great power in Belgium. It regards itself, in some sort, as the recognized religion of the State. It rules in the government universities, as well as in its own free university of Brussels. The Liberal press is the daily exponent and defender of its principles; and all the power and social influence at their command are directed without cease against Catholicism. Nowhere, indeed, are the Freemasons so unanimous or so powerful as to-day in Belgium. Their recent defeat in the elections, and the revived political activity of the Catholics, have roused their fears as well as their anger. Scandalous attacks on the Church and her ministers, infidel and immoral publications, are among the means to which they do not scruple to have recourse. There is a

society in Belgium, the rules of which we have now before us, which imposes on its members an oath to exterminate "priestcraft," and to root out the Catholic faith. Among these rules is this—that all possible measures be taken by the members to prevent the presence of priests at the births, marriages, or deaths of their friends, relatives, or dependents. An exemplification of this spirit was given on the occasion of the burial of Verhaegen, a noted infidel, and a leader among the Liberals. His funeral was attended by a large procession of his friends; speeches were delivered over his coffin; and at the conclusion of this public manifestation of infidelity, a young man threw himself on the grave, and gave public utterance to the hope that they might all, like their friend and brother Verhaegen, live and die without the priests, without the sacraments, and without God! Such are the enemies which Catholicism in Belgium has to fight against, and in such the ministry finds its chief friends and supporters. Freemasonry boasts at the present time 1,800 lodges, and 500,000 acting members, scattered about in different countries; its inactive members are estimated at about three millions. Although the French* and Piedmontese armies, in the highest as well as in the lower ranks, absorb a very large proportion of acting members, yet we believe the number of Masons in Belgium to be very large; we know they are very active, and show their colours with less reserve than is customary among Masons. At the funeral of Verhaegen, the Masons of Brussels attended, bearing the triangle, square, and compasses, and other masonic emblems. Conspicuous among them was Brother Van Schoer, who appeared in the midst of the procession vested with the insignia of office, as representative of Italian Freemasonry. In their speeches, too, there was none of that reserve which usually veils their designs, and withholds their blasphemy from the common ear. Speaking in the name of the *Grand-Orient* of Belgium, Mason de Fré said that Verhaegen had brought from Italy "a treaty of fraternal union, and of imperishable friendship between the *Grand-Orient* of Turin and the *Grand-Orient* of Brussels." Another brother of the sect boasted that it was by means of Freemasonry that the defunct grand-master had organized the Liberal party in Belgium. "His voice from this tomb," he added, "tells us, that he whom it incloses remained faithful to his principles to the end [Verhaegen died a professed infidel]; he never knew the weaknesses nor the superstitious apprehensions of the last hour, and his death was not, like that of many others, a suicide of his conscience. Such a death is the consecration of our principles."

Besides their alliance with Freemasonry, and their general attitude of hostility towards the Catholic Church, there are certain specific hostile measures on the part of the Government which may be briefly stated thus:—the law against charitable bequests; the confiscation of the Catholic *Bourses* at the university of Louvain; the interference with the liberty of the pulpit, and in the management of the funds for the repair and support of the parish churches; the violation of the cemeteries. The gross and outrageous infraction of Catholic liberty involved in this last measure has raised a storm of indignation throughout the country, which it will not be easy to allay. Setting the constitution at defiance, local parish authorities have insisted on burying Protestants and excommunicated Catholics in consecrated ground. The law has ordained that distinct burying-grounds should be provided for Catholics, Protestants, and Jews. In the teeth of this law Catholic cemeteries have been forcibly taken possession of by the parish officials, and have been frequently used of late, in spite of protest and resistance on the part of the parish priests, as a burying-place for non-Catholics. The Liberals claim the use of the Catholic cemeteries as a public right, violating by this claim an express statute of

* The conduct of the French generals in Mexico, as well as in Rome, shows to what school they belong.

the Constitution. For the last month or two petitions against this illegal encroachment have been in course of signature. They have already been signed by nearly 750,000 persons, exceeding by more than two-thirds the memorable petition of 1829. To this firm assertion of Catholic rights there has been so violent an opposition on the part of the Liberals as to lead in some instances to riotous demonstrations, accompanied with blasphemous cries. The Liberal press has teemed with insults. But Catholic feeling has now been thoroughly roused, and, with a unanimity and determination, arising perhaps in a measure from the confidence inspired by the Congress of Malines, the Catholics insist upon the rights guaranteed to them by the Constitution.

This appeal to the Constitution has given rise to a fierce controversy as to the principles on which it is based, and as to whether Catholics, who now appeal to its guarantees in behalf of their liberties, are sincere in their professed admiration of those principles. On their part, the Liberals argue that Catholics as such cannot be sincerely attached to a constitution which, in a Catholic country, consecrates the principle that the State has no concern with religion, is bound by no precept of the Gospel, and in the government of its subjects is guided by no law of the Church. In harmony with this principle the State has abolished the legal observance of the Sunday, degraded marriage to a civil contract, and banished religion from the State universities. Such principles, with the consequences which naturally flow from them, have been repeatedly condemned by the Popes, and more especially by the famous Encyclical Letter of Pope Gregory XVI. "How, therefore," ask the Belgian Liberals, "can good Catholics reconcile with the obedience due to the Holy See, the veneration which they profess for the Constitution, and the prominent part which they took in the original framing of this fundamental pact?" Catholics elsewhere, indeed, can only entertain a feeling the very opposite of veneration for the Belgian constitution. In the constitution of no other country in Europe is there such a formal denial of the place which religion holds in the government of men. It is mere hypocrisy, however, or worse, on the part of the Liberals, to question the attachment of their adversaries to the principles of the Constitution. The question in reality is, whether the Catholics of Belgium have not far too great an attachment to it, considering those provisions in it which are but little in harmony with Catholic traditions?

This attachment can, however, be accounted for, and under the circumstances even reconciled with Catholic principles. First of all, we must call to mind the condition of the country at the time the Constitution was formulated. At that period Belgium had long ceased to rank as a Catholic state. The French revolutionists, on seizing the country in 1792, destroyed the existing Constitution; and Napoleon, on restoring the Christian religion in France, established a new order of things throughout the French republic, of which Belgium then formed a part. The basis of this celebrated convention was as follows:—"The Government recognizes the Catholic, Apostolic, Roman religion as the religion which is professed by the far largest number of the citizens of the French republic." The Holy See, under the force of circumstances, allowed this declaration, which is a negation of the ancient Catholic state, to be inserted in the Concordat of 1801. We may remark, by the way, that this revolutionary measure of the French republic was revoked by Louis XVIII., who, on mounting the throne, declared the Catholic religion to be the religion of the State. That since 1830 the French Government still recognizes the Catholic religion to be the religion of the State is evidenced, were it in no other way, by the attempts which it makes from time to time to invoke the Gallican liberties or to control the bishops. But Belgium at that period, being united to Holland, unfortunately remained under the revolutionary bondage; and this state of things was recognized in the Concordat of 1827, concluded by Leo XII. with the Dutch Government. It is therefore clear that at

the time when the new constitution had to be framed, Belgium was not a Catholic state, but only a state in which the large majority of citizens were Catholics. Such being the case, it would have appeared but natural that the majority of citizens should have desired a constitution in conformity with Catholic principles, such, for instance, as were laid down in the Encyclical of Gregory XVI. That such an attempt was not made or suggested in the Constituent Assembly of 1830, in which out of the 200 members 140 were Catholics, and of these 13 were priests, can be accounted for by various reasons which more or less powerfully influenced the different members in their decision. In the first place, the Belgian Church had no pleasant recollections of its connection with the State, either under the Spanish Government, or later under that of Austria. The Spanish kings, abusing the privileges which had been conferred on them, were wont to require from Rome, whenever the Holy See had occasion to promulgate new laws for the universal Church, that these laws should not apply to their states. The Austrian Government showed still less ceremony: it simply proscribed all enactments emanating from the Holy See. The Josephism of Austria is not forgotten in Belgium. In Belgium, says the Rev. P. de Buck, a learned Belgian Jesuit,—in a disquisition which he held last year at the Congress of Malines—when it was a Catholic state the bishops were not even allowed to ask the Pope for the power to dispense from the observances of Lent; they were forced to accord these dispensations *auctoritate propria*, in spite of the reclamations of the Holy See. In all this, he continues, there was nothing very astonishing. The members of the imperial family of Austria may have been religious; but their agents in Belgium had but little religion: they were only remarkable for their hypocrisy. They went to mass with large prayer-books embroidered with silk and gold; but they had printed *typis regis*, at Brussels, the works of Jean-Jacques Rousseau. The corrupt Government of Louis XV. never went so far. Again the same writer remarks, in speaking of the religious orders—and he expresses the general opinion of Belgian Catholics—that the memory of past times is full of bitterness for them. They know that Maria Theresa commenced their destruction; that Joseph II. continued it; that the Republic completed it; that Napoleon put down every attempt for their restoration; and that King William thwarted all the attempts at revival which were set on foot under his reign. The past, therefore, causes them no regret. They prefer their actual poverty without a State religion, but with liberty, to their former wealth in a reputed Catholic state, subject to the perpetual interference of Government in their affairs. The State for ever interfering in everything—that it is which scares them: of the past they know nothing but that. They might have completely forgotten it, had they not perceived an intention to revive this monstrous abuse of a former age in order to bring about the same results. This same writer also remarks, with apparent approval, that there was one Belgian Catholic journal which had the courage to interrupt the concert of praise performed in honour of the Austrian Concordat, and to venture publicly to prefer the Concordat of 1801, even with the organic articles which are not fallen into disuse, to the Viennese Convention.

There was another opinion which had a certain influence with the Catholics of Belgium in 1830, of which we will say no more than that it owed its origin to the writings of *L'Avenir* and to the condemned theories of Lamennais. But the argument which had most weight, the only argument in favour of the Belgian Constitution, indeed, which did not conflict with Catholic principle, was the one of necessity. "There were," says a writer in the *Précis Historiques* (a purely religious publication, conducted by a Belgian Jesuit, the Rev. P. Terwecoren), "two opinions in the country face to face; on the one part were fervent and faithful Catholics, on the other were the partisans, or the descendants of the partisans, of all the governments under which the

Catholics had suffered and groaned for fifty years. To secure internal peace, the first good of a country, it was necessary to frame a constitution which would be neither a victory nor a defeat for either party. It was necessary to come to an understanding. Mutual concessions, then, were made on the one part and on the other; concessions out of which arose a great compromise between the two parties which composed almost the entire nation—a fundamental pact—the Constitution. This is the second treaty of peace, which makes it a duty for Catholics to accept the Constitution *sans arrière-pensée*." The first treaty, in the writer's opinion, was the French Concordat of 1801.

Of course, it is a sufficient answer to the Liberals of Belgium to say, that under the peculiar condition of the country it was lawful for Catholics to adopt a constitution which, under happier circumstances, would be regarded by them as defective and faulty; and that, thus adopted, it is their duty to uphold it, and to be grateful for the liberties they enjoy under its protection. They are more especially grateful for their relief from the abominable abuses which the absolutism of the civil power in the last and in the beginning of the present century entailed upon the Church in Belgium, as well as in almost every other country in Europe. On the other hand, it must be remembered, that the Belgian Constitution is, not the inauguration of a new system, but the compromise of a Catholic principle. A godless State, in which truth is not distinguished from error, is no model for Catholic nations to adopt, in this more than in any other age. It were even better, perhaps, for the Church to sacrifice some of her liberties than forego her duty as a public teacher of truth in the State.

FRANCE.—The stir in the political life of France, and the desire for political emancipation, which have led to the formation of a small but vigorous and intellectual opposition, have had a corresponding effect upon the operatives of Paris. A manifesto, signed by sixty workmen, speaking in the name of their fellows, insists upon their right of being represented in the Chambers by members of their own class. They declare that their interests and opinions are by no means represented by those who profess to speak in their name and act on their behalf. At the elections of the 20th and 21st of March, for the first and fifth districts of Paris, they have, therefore, resolved to bring forward two candidates chosen from among themselves. This determination has thrown the democratic camp into confusion, and startled the legitimate leaders of the Parisian democracy. Several members of the Electoral Committees desire a compromise, and propose to support the election of at least one of the two workmen candidates. Thus the democracy of the bourgeoisie is brought face to face with that lower democracy of Paris which is the terror and the curse of France. The appearance, again, of the "Red Spectre," speaking in the voice and uttering the sentiments of '48, has caused an alarm which will bring an accession to the ranks of Imperialism and break the strength of the Opposition.

The operatives of Paris are intelligent; but they have undergone a bad political education, and their heads are filled with the wildest illusions. M. Jules Simon told the *Corps Législatif* last month, that the workmen are quite changed; that they do not want now what they wanted in 1848; that they are improved, reformed, and the best people in the world. But M. Jules Simon appears not to see the workman as he is in reality, but only as he appears in the dreams of democracy. We can ill conceive such an improvement in so short a time, without, at least, the aid of Christianity; and Christian ideas are becoming weaker and weaker every day in the large mass of the working classes of Paris. The higher classes of French society, so long alienated from the Church, are beginning to return to-day; but the lower classes in most of the cities of France are unhappily steeped in impiety.

It is mere folly to believe that the infidel workman will not be a socialist and a communist. M. Jules Simon, the believer in natural religion, has yet to learn that political, like other bad passions, are not to be overmastered by pure philosophy, or will yield to a lesser force than that of the Christian faith. The political movement on the part of the working classes has excited attention in Paris, and awakened a curiosity to learn their opinions and aims. This curiosity has been gratified in rather a singular manner. At the time of the Great Exhibition of London, delegates from the various trades of Paris came over to England, and on their return published reports on what they had seen and learned. These documents are very curious. Besides technical returns, these various reports contain economical, social, and political views of the highest interest. Here are to be found, expressed in their own simple language, the desires, the illusions, the fears, and the errors of the workmen of Paris. Each trade drew up its own report. "We are not," said the delegates of the white-leather dressers, "writers nor historians, and we should never have taken up the pen for anything else than our own business, had not the suffrages of our colleagues called upon us to undertake this task. We shall, however, do our best to acquit ourselves of it properly." "Belgium," they say, in the course of their report, "has sent us workmen of our trade, many of whom are fixed in Paris. Our masters (*patrons*) often prefer them to us on account of their *docility*." In almost all the reports of the various trades are to be found the same sullen discontent, and the same implacable hatred against their masters. In speaking of their employers, the workmen in the glove trade say that "they do business in a boggling kind of way, and that they do all they can to reduce the cost of the manufacture, in order to make good their mistakes: hence arises our slavery, and the lowering of wages in certain houses. What matters it to these gentlemen that the workman is miserable? The poorer he is, the more submissive; the more he humbles himself, the more work is heaped upon him, without his daring to murmur or complain. What is it to them that a father of a family brings up his children feeble and idiotic? Their children go to college, and health sparkles in their countenances." The printers speak in the same strain. "In our workshops," they say, "the workman is completely at the mercy of the simple will of the proprietor. He arranges, according to his own good will, the work and the wages of those he employs. He has the law on his side; and the good understanding which ought to exist between workmen and masters is too often changed into a *hostility*, the more unfortunate as it destroys on both sides the sentiment of justice." We seem to be listening again to the declamations of 1848, and the theories of the Luxembourg. Besides the feeling of hatred towards their employers, the workmen of Paris display great ignorance of the laws of political economy: they are almost all enemies of the liberty of work and of competition. "Competition," say the working jewellers, "is at the bottom of almost all our misfortunes, and is the cause of the misery, the sufferings, and the immorality of the labouring classes." The same thought runs through the whole of these reports. At the end of these reports are the reforms demanded. They are as follows:—Liberty of association, the right of reunion, the organization of corporate bodies, the limitation of the hours of work, and the fixing of wages by the State. A strange confusion of ideas betrays itself in the effort to break through the centralizing effect of the Imperial Government, and in the dash of communism which accompanies it.

In the political manifesto of the working men of Paris similar sentiments are to be found. There is the same intense hatred of the bourgeois as their employers, the same disgust at the word wages, and the like illusion as to the power of doing away altogether with the necessity of employers, by means of some great political and economic changes, to be sought in a pure democracy.

It must, however, be acknowledged, that since 1848 there is much improvement as to the political formula adopted. We hear no more of the communistic and socialist axioms proper to the revolutionary demagogues of that period. Yet if the ideas, as well as the political terms, are changed for the better, the motives which are at work are still the same. There is the same ungovernable pride, the same hatred of the bourgeoisie, the same illusions as to an unattainable happiness. Although, as is likely, it may not succeed in its attempt at the moment, this lower democracy is a power which will yet be felt and feared in France. It is not a little curious to observe that, together with the political demonstration on the part of the working men, the discussions of the clubs of 1848 have re-opened in Paris. In the Salle Barthélemy, and in the Rue de la Paix, public lectures, by the permission of M. Duruy, the Minister of Public Instruction, have been delivered before crowded audiences. Some of the sentiments proclaimed in the Salle Barthélemy, by MM. Floquet, Hébrard, and several others, are such as these, for instance:—That the Girondins deserved to be despised, as faint and impotent revolutionists; and amidst the applause of the hall one of the speakers declared, that the Gironde had had but two men, and that these two men were two women, Madame Roland and Charlotte Corday. The superior policy of the "Mountain" was upheld and assented to; Robespierre was glorified; and even Marat, in the name of the services which he had rendered to France, and for the purity of his intentions, was absolved. "His journal may have been bad," said the speaker, "but he himself was good;" and then he added, "Since it has been permitted to M. de Lamartine to call Charlotte Corday '*the angel of assassination*,' it may be permitted to me to say that Marat was '*the demon of patriotism*.'" Again, such an act of unqualified tyranny as the civil constitution of the clergy was warmly eulogized by M. Floquet. In another sitting of the Salle Barthélemy, one of the speakers approved of the celebrated revolt of the regiment of Chateauxvieux in 1790, and insisted, that when tyranny was on one side, and the country on the other, insurrection was the duty of soldiers. He vilified M. de Bouillé, who put that revolt down, as guilty of having hindered the sovereignty of the bayonet from coming to the aid of the sovereignty of the pikes of the people. All this was spoken amidst the frantic applause of the crowded hall.

It is difficult to know what conclusions to draw from such phenomena as the revival of the clubs and debates of 1848, under the express authorization of the most despotic Government in Europe. Is Napoleon seeking to terrify the turbulent citizens of Paris, and to check the formidable opposition to his rule which is rising up in the Chambers and in the country? Or, in the face of growing political difficulties, is he intending to put himself at the head of the European revolution, and take the part assigned to him by Prince Metternich, of revolutionary emperor? The temptation is great, but terrible would be the risk. In the moment of indecision and suspense comes the dagger of the assassin to quicken his resolution. The bombs of Orsini preceded the war in Italy. What effect the attempt of Greco to put Mazzini's theory of the dagger into practice will have upon the policy of Napoleon it is impossible to say. The miserable plot itself was too deficient in dramatic effect to excite for long the minds of the Parisian public. But the trial of the four conspirators exhibited the reckless character of the tools which the secret societies make use of for their guilty purposes. It affords another glimpse into the nature of that vast anti-social and irreligious conspiracy to which Mazzini has given his name, and which professes the principle of assassination; which murdered Count Rossi on the steps of the Vatican; which put a lapis-lazuli-hilted dagger into the hands of Gallenga to assassinate Charles Albert, king of Sardinia; which gave to Tibaldi, to Orsini, and to Greco, "the price of blood," and the murderous weapons which, on three

several occasions, were to have taken the life of Napoleon, and to have delivered Europe over to massacre and anarchy.

At the head of such a conspiracy, so sanguinary and so wide-spread, which aims at nothing less than the destruction of religion and the complete recasting of the whole political and social order, stands Mazzini. His is the brain that contrives the plots which he leaves to others to execute, or to perish in the attempt. Into the question of the legal proofs as to the complicity of Mazzini in the plot of the man whom he describes as "an enthusiastic patriot," against the life of Napoleon, it is not our business to enter. Enough has been established to show his moral guilt—more, at least, than his simple denial can ever rebut. The miserable agents, Greco, Trabucco, Imperatori, and Scaglioni, are now expiating their guilt, whilst the more guilty instigator or suggester of the crime has escaped all punishment. There is something so abhorrent to the English mind in theories of assassination, in secret societies, and in covert oaths, that people naturally recoil from imputing such crimes to men who are to be met in our streets, walking arm in arm with English gentlemen. But when these men turn out to have been, if not paymasters, at least companions and correspondents of hired assassins, whom they describe as enthusiastic patriots, such a revulsion is occasioned in public feeling, as—whatever folly may be allowed to private friendship—will hardly permit the house of a minister of the Crown to be made a receptacle of letters from, or a place of resort for, foreign conspirators against the life of a neighbouring sovereign and ally, and against the general peace of Europe. Since the debates in which Mr. Stansfeld avowed his friendship and intimacy of eighteen years' standing with Mazzini, and Mr. Hennessy most opportunely pointed out the infamous character of Mazzini's doctrines, a conviction has very generally sprung up that the part which Mr. Stansfeld has taken is inconsistent with his character as a minister of the Crown. The debates on this subject have had one good effect, in directing public attention to the character of that Mazzinian conspiracy in Italy, which employs the dagger of the assassin as its means, and has for its end the overthrow of institutions held sacred even in England.

A pamphlet has appeared in Paris, which, though not published, is widely circulated among the Protestants of France, and from which we propose to give some extracts. It contains:—1. A "Communication of the Presbyteral Council of Paris to the Faithful [of the Reformed Church] upon the Non-Renewal of the Suffraganship of M. A. Coquerel, Junior;" dated March 2nd, 1864. 2. "The Report to the same Presbyteral Council of a Commission of eleven Persons appointed to Report upon Suffraganships." 3. "A Report of the Discussions at Two Meetings of the Council," held on Friday, February 19th, 1864, and, by adjournment, on Friday, February 26th.

The subjects discussed in these papers are, in a great proportion, interesting only to French Protestants; such as questions connected with the appointment of "suffragans,"—*i. e.*, substitutes nominated by a Protestant pastor, when disabled by illness, to supply his place—and their acceptance by the council, &c. But in other parts we have some very curious indications of the state of opinion and belief among the Protestants of France. It seems that a large proportion of the laity belongs to what calls itself the "Liberal" school, as opposed to the "Orthodox," but that the latter has a considerable majority in the council. As to M. Coquerel, Junior, who has now been deprived of his office, the charge against him is that he has lent his pulpit to two preachers who wholly deny the supernatural, and especially the Divine character of our Blessed Lord; and that he is editor of a magazine called the *Lien*, in which he has spoken in high terms of such men, and especially, among others, of M. Renan. Thus, for instance, he has published that "he differs, not slightly but totally, from the orthodox, in his manner of under-

standing the doctrines of the Trinity, original sin, expiation, inspiration, and other fundamental doctrines." It is on these facts that the Council has refused to renew the authorization which, in consequence of his not being a "pastor," but a "suffragan pastor" under the appointment of another, required to be renewed yearly. Their address to "the faithful" ends thus:—"The Presbyteral Council has not taken this resolution without great pain. They have made a sacrifice in breaking the bonds which unite to the flock a pastor whose character and talents they honour; but they continue convinced that they are acting according to their duty and their right, and in the interest of the Christian religion in general, and of the whole Protestant Church and of the Church of Paris in particular. We should feel ill at ease," they continue, "if, in coming to this decision, we had infringed the religious liberty of a pastor, and the free and public exposition of what he believes. But, thanks be to God and to our just and generous institutions, there is at the present day nothing of this. M. Coquerel is free to profess what he believes, and to gather around him those who share in his belief; but our conscience does not permit us to authorize him to propagate it in our name and under our auspices. We are profoundly convinced that it is conformable neither with the teaching of the Word of God, nor with the doctrines of the universal Christian Church, nor with the faith of our fathers, nor with that of the great number of the faithful of our Church, at this day our companions in life and very dear brethren in Jesus Christ. We call for the blessing of God upon our Church. We ask of Him, and you will ask of Him together with us, that He will cause the trials of the times through which we are passing to turn to His own glory and to the advancement of His kingdom."

What is chiefly interesting to an Englishman in this pamphlet is the prominent part taken in the whole affair by M. Guizot. All the world knows that, according to the plan devised by Calvin, ecclesiastical government is vested in a body consisting of a certain number of preachers and a certain number of laymen,—the latter being called in Scotland "lay elders," at Paris, "ancients" (*anciens*). Of these M. Guizot is one. The account of the discussion makes it clear that his is the ruling mind in the "Council." We quote some of his words. He denounces "the classification of the members into an orthodox party, which is the majority in the Council, and a liberal party, which has numerous representatives in the Church. M. Guizot claims for himself and his friends the title of "liberal Christian." He is "astonished that M. Coquerel should reproach the Commission with occupying itself much about the rights of the Councils of the Church, and very little about the interests of the souls to which he has devoted his ministry. It is precisely in the interests of the souls of the flock, and more particularly of that portion of the flock with which M. Coquerel is in pastoral relation, that we concern ourselves." At a later period of the discussion M. Guizot maintains the right and absolute duty of the Council to examine M. Coquerel on points of doctrine. He adds: "Moreover, the situation of the Church is aggravated; attacks are more violent than they were ten years ago. We must look more closely into the matter. How is it possible that we should remain indifferent when there are pastors declaring that they do not believe in the supernatural; that they do not believe in miracles; that Jesus Christ is a mere man? In a sermon on the unity of the Church, M. Coquerel, Junior, called the Socinians his brother Christians. A Church in which the Socinians are admitted as brethren will no longer be a Christian Church. The Socinians, like every one else, have a right to unite themselves. The memory of the Inquisition, and of the period of persecutions, is invoked very wrongly: times are happily changed. In our days, every one is free to unite himself with those who partake his belief. We do nothing against the liberty of any man; but it is impossible to demand of us that we should be indifferent in the presence of manifestations, whether by preaching or otherwise, against that which we

consider the very foundation of Christianity. It is to assure ourselves as to what M. Coquerel thinks upon this subject, that we call for these explanations." [M. Coquerel: I have not said that I was a Socinian—I have written the contrary—but I have declared that I regard the Socinians as Christians. M. Montandon (a preacher) said that it would be a want of charity to exclude the Socinians from the Church of Jesus Christ.] M. Guizot went on: "There is a current setting in against the Christian faith, and it is our duty carefully to watch against anything which may swell its waters. For my part, I, too, attach great importance to religious sentiments, but I regard dogmas as the source of religious sentiments. It is the belief in the Divinity of Jesus Christ, in His Incarnation, in Redemption, which produces the Christian sentiment: dogmas are the foundation of it. We have no wish to drive out anybody. Every one may remain in the Church; but is it possible for us to give to the Church, as its leaders, those who show themselves so indifferent to dogmas—those who reject that which we consider as the very foundation of the faith?"

The result was that the Council resolved, on the motion of M. Guizot, to defer its absolute determination for a week; after which it refused to renew the authorization of M. Coquerel by a vote of 12 members against 8. Two others were present, one of whom refused to vote at all, and the other put in a voting-paper not filled up either "yes" or "no."

The correspondent of the *Guardian*, at Paris, reports that on the occasion of M. Coquerel, Junior, preaching his last sermon at the Oratory, the congregation made a very impetuous demonstration in his favour. The pamphlet from which we have made these extracts runs to fifty-seven pages; so that we have been unable to do more than give some idea of its contents.

We have no space for comment; but our readers will appreciate the importance of these facts, not only as illustrating the state of opinion among French Protestants in general, but also in giving us a very interesting and pleasing insight into M. Guizot's religious convictions.

DR. DÖLLINGER AND THE MUNICH CONGRESS.—The following letter, with reference to some remarks that appeared in our last number, has been addressed to the Catholic newspapers by Sir R. Blennerhassett. See *Weekly Register* of 29th February and *Tablet* of 5th March.

"Sir,—A writer in the current number of the *Dublin Review*, giving an account of the Congress held at Munich last autumn, states, as one of two facts, the 'importance of which cannot be exaggerated,' that 'a solemn protest of the so-called Roman or Scholastic school, against certain views contained in the President's address, was publicly read before the meeting.' It is only due to the eminent divine who presided on that occasion (Dr. Döllinger), that two other 'important facts' should be known, of which the writer in the *Dublin Review* was obviously unaware.

"It is true that such a protest, signed by eight persons, was read before the Congress. But it is also true (1) That the author of this protest (Dr. Heinrich, of Mentz) declared that his principal object in drawing it up was to preclude possible misconceptions of the speaker's meaning in others; that another of the protesters confessed to not having heard the speech, and a third that he had failed to understand it. (2) It is true, in the next place, that the protest itself *was withdrawn as publicly and as solemnly as it was made* before the breaking up of the Congress, upon which the whole assembly rose up as one man to testify their personal respect for their President and their sense of his eminent services to the Church.

"There are other inaccuracies in the account of the Congress given in the *Dublin*, but they do not concern the subject of this letter.

"I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

"Munich, Feb. 23, 1864.

"ROWLAND BLENNERHASSETT.

"P.S.—The fact of the *Dublin* having only just reached Munich will account for my not having written earlier."

In reply to these statements, the *Weekly Register* of March 19th contained a letter from a correspondent, signing himself A. B., from which we make the following extract:—

"The impression left by these assertions [on the part of Sir R. Blennerhassett], coming as they do directly from Munich, would be that a very insignificant minority of the Catholic men of science in Germany had protested on this occasion, and that even they had made the *amende honorable* before the whole meeting, and had joined in a general acclamation of the President.

"I will ask you, sir, to allow me to observe that the literary and scientific position of the eminent men who thus protested is such that they could not fail to know very exactly what Dr. Döllinger had meant to say; and that their personal influence in Germany is so great that a very large body of leading Catholics have rallied round them. M. Heinrich is Professor of Dogmatic Theology at Mayence, and M. Monfang is President of the Seminary in the same city; they are the joint editors of the *Katholik*, a scientific review, which has a wide circulation and is greatly esteemed. MM. Phillips, Hergenröther, Hettinger, Haffner, Scheeben, Schaetzler, the remaining six who protested, are well known as being among the most distinguished professors of theology and philosophy in the universities and seminaries of Vienna, Würzburg, Freiburg, Mayence, and Cologne. Now such men as these certainly knew what they were doing, and would not have taken upon themselves the unpleasant office of protesting against the views of so eminent a man as Dr. Döllinger, had they intended immediately afterwards to eat their own words, and to confess that they had not understood the question. What is then the real state of the case? I will only refer to the *compte rendu* published by the secretary of the meeting. *The protest was not withdrawn at all.* In the seventh session a question arose as to whether it should be printed with the other business of the Congress. Dr. Döllinger observed that it would be better to omit his own two discourses than to give cause for a controversy which might be continued throughout the country; but it was objected that under any circumstances it would probably be impossible to prevent the publicity of these discourses. Then those eight professors who had signed the protest, after having deliberated together, declared that they had no intention of questioning the orthodoxy of Dr. Döllinger, but desired that his discourses should not be accepted by the public as the programme of the Congress, and that their silence should not be regarded as signifying assent to all the assertions put forward by him. They added that they did not consider the publication of their protest a matter of importance, provided that a notice of it had a place in the minutes of the meeting, and that mention was made of their present declaration. The assembly was glad to see the difficulty thus disposed of, and resolved accordingly."

Since the above was in type, a most important document has appeared in the public journals, viz., a brief from the Pope to the Archbishop of Munich, in which the Holy Father adverts to the extreme surprise with which, in the first instance, he learned that the Congress was to be the act of private individuals, apart from all ecclesiastical direction and control; and this in times when the authority of the Episcopate was never more needed to secure the unity and integrity of Catholic doctrine. He characterizes the proceeding as altogether novel and unprecedented in the Church. The uneasiness he had experienced had been further increased by the remembrance of the necessity which had arisen of censuring the works of certain German writers who had revived the errors of a false scientific method, and by the knowledge that amongst the Catholic men of science there were some who were disposed, in the

pursuit of an illusive liberty, to overstep the limits prescribed by the Church. In particular he adverts to the existence in Germany of false opinions prejudicial to the ancient scholastic teaching—opinions which impugn the authority of the Church herself, who has so long sanctioned its principles and method. He hopes, nevertheless, from the report he has received, that, by God's blessing, this assembly, to which, when approved by the archbishop, he had accorded his benediction, will have a beneficial result. He concludes with some most important counsels in respect to the submission of reason, in scientific pursuits, not merely to the defined dogma of the Church, but also to all doctrinal decisions emanating from the Pontifical Congregations, and to all those dogmatic conclusions which have received the universal sanction of theologians, although their rejection may not incur the charge of heresy; and expresses a hope that such is the meaning and intent of the declaration of submission made by the assembled men of science at the Congress.

INDEX.

ALPHONSO'S (S.) Sacred Poetry, translated from the Italian by Father Coffin, *noticed*, 233-236.

Analecta Juris Pontificii, 143, 147-151.

Anderdon (Rev. W. H.), Sermon-Notes by Two Poor Children, *noticed*, 237.

Ange (l') de l'Eucharistie : Vie et Esprit de Marie-Eustelle, *noticed*, 230-232.

Attwood (E. W.), Stromata Pro-catholica, *noticed*, 507, 508.

BAINI, Memorie de G. P. da Palestrina, 143.

Bayma (Fr. Joseph), The Love of Religious Perfection, *noticed*, 509.

Belgium, 542-547 : election results and prospects, 542, 543 ; freemasonry, 543, 544 ; government measures hostile to the Church, 544, 545 ; Catholic appeal to the principles of the constitution ; its historical import, 546, 547.

Benedict XIV., his directions and decisions on the subject of church music, 148-151 ; Treatise on Heroic Virtue, 461-463.

Bernard (S.), Life of, by J. C. Morison, *noticed*, 211-217.

BLOMFIELD'S (Dr.) LIFE AND TIMES, 1-23 : the various forms of character and schools of opinion that have appeared in the Established Church from the beginning of the present century, 1-6 ; personal characteristics of Dr. Blomfield, 6-10 ; his lady patroness, 10, 11 ; he becomes bishop of Chester, 11, 12 ; is translated to London, 12 ; opposes Catholic Emancipation, 13 ; his dealings with the Tractarians, 13-15 ; resignation of his see, 16 ; the last scenes of his life, 16-18 ; contrast between Dr. Blomfield and the Curé of Ars, 18-22 ; the biography a model of its class, 22, 23.

Bona (Cardinal), De Discretionem Spirituum, 461, 462.

Brigid's (S.) Orphanage, Seventh Annual Report of, *noticed*, 278.

British Critic, influence of the, under Mr. Newman, 175-179.

Brogie (Albert de), L'Eglise et l'Empire Romain au Quatrième Siècle, *noticed*, 223, 224.

Browne (Professor), The Pentateuch and the Elohist Psalms, *noticed*, 198-201.

Brownlow (W. R.), How and Why I became a Catholic, *noticed*, 505-507.

Brownson's Quarterly Review, fourth series, Vols. I.-IV., see "Theological Errors of the Day."

Burton (Rev. J. W.), Letters from Rome to Friends in England, *reviewed*, 23, &c.

CHAMPAGNY (le Comte de), Les Antonins, *noticed*, 217-222.

Chant, plain, its capacities and failures, 152-157.

- Christian Remembrancer, January, 1864, *noticed*, 515, 516.
 Christophe (l'Abbé J. B.), Histoire de la Papauté pendant le Quatorzième et le Quinzième Siècle, *noticed*, 225-228.
 Church, the, and *Modern Civilization*, from the "Civiltà Cattolica" of August 15, 1863, 238-242.
 Church Times, the, description of an Anglican function, 281, 282; discreditable remarks on the Santiago catastrophe, 431.
 Churton (Archdeacon), Gongora: an Historical and Critical Essay, with Translations, *reviewed*, 95-127.
 Cissey (Louis de), Vie de Marguerite du Saint Sacrement, *noticed*, 228-230.
 Cochin (Augustin), L'Abolition de l'Esclavage, *reviewed*, 328, &c.
 Coffin (Father), the Sacred Poetry of S. Alphonso Maria Liguori, translated from the Italian, *noticed*, 233-236.
 Colombière's (Rev. Fr.) Spiritual Retreat, *noticed*, 508.
 Coquerel (M.) Junior, deprived of his pastoral office, 550-552.
 Crisis of Protestantism in Holland, from the "Correspondant" of September, 1863, 248, 249.
 Crookall (Dr.), Schmid's Masses, 128, 151.
 Curé of Ars, the, contrasted with Dr. Blomfield, 18-22.

DALGAIRNS (Very Rev. F.), the Holy Communion: its Philosophy, Theology, and Practice, 471, 472.

——— The London Oratory and Mr. Newdegate, M.P., *noticed*, 507.

Darbuix (l'Abbé Pascal), La Vie et les Œuvres de Marie Lataste, *noticed*, 232, 233.

Davidson (Dr.), Introduction to the Old Testament, *noticed*, 201-203.

De Lisle's (Mr.) theory of "union," 533.

De Mirville (J. E.), Pneumatologie: Des Esprits et de leurs Manifestations diverses, 445, 455.

De Morgan (Mrs.), From Matter to Spirit, 445-452, 459.

Denis (S.), his identity with the Areopagite, 488, 489.

Des Mousseaux (le Chevalier Gougenot), La Magie du dix-neuvième Siècle: ses Agents, ses Vérités, ses Mensonges, 445, 446, 449, 452-455.

Dolan (Rev. W. T.), The Gregorian Hymns for Vespers, 128, 154.

Döllinger (Dr.), address at the Munich Congress, 274, 552, 553.

Donovan (Fr. Francis), his escape from the scaffold, 315, 316.

Doyle (J. E.), A Chronicle of England, *noticed*, 209-211.

Dupanloup (Mgr.) La Charité Chrétienne et ses Œuvres, *noticed*, 195-198.

ECCLESIASTIC, the, November, 1863, 279, 286.

Edinburgh Review, January, 1864, *noticed*, 514, 515, 517.

Elizabeth (S.) of Hungary, misrepresented by Mr. Kingsley, 519, 520.

Eucharist, Blessed, Mystery of the, its relations with scientific notions of matter, 472-480.

FATHER FABER, 159-163: spiteful comments of the Saturday Review, 159, 160; F. Faber considered as a priest, 160, 161; a preacher, 161; a guide

of souls, 161, 162; a spiritual writer, 162, 163; a composer of hymns, 163; comp. 158; and as the head of the London Oratory, 163.

FATHER MATHEW, 313-327: his career an episode in the moral and social history of the time, 313; his birth and education, 314, 315; he becomes a Capuchin friar and a priest; his ministrations at Cork, 315, 316; his experiences in the cholera hospital, 316-318; prevalent habits of intemperance in Ireland; failure of all attempts at reformation, 318-321; Father Mathew founds his Society; its rapid progress, 321-323; belief in his miraculous powers, 323, 324; diminished consumption of ardent spirits, 324, 325; visit to England, 325, 326; pecuniary embarrassments, visit to America, illnesses and death, 326; results of the movement, 326, 327.

Faith and charity, relations of, 30-33; faith and reason, 33-39.

Fénelon's condemned propositions, 91.

France, 258-260, 547-552; the proposed Congress at Paris, 258, 259; reply of the Pope, 259, 260; political manifesto of the working men of Paris, 547-549; revival of clubs, 549; the Greco plot, 549, 550; M. Guizot and M. Coquerel, 550-552.

Freppel (l'Abbé), *Les Pères Apostoliques et leur Epoque*, noticed, 487.

——— *Les Apologistes Chrétiens au Deuxième Siècle*, noticed, 487.

——— *S. Irenée et l'Eloquence Chrétienne dans le Gaul, pendant les deux premiers Siècles*, noticed, 488, 489.

Frohschammer (Dr.), his errors respecting faith and science condemned by the Holy See, 80-84, 272, 273.

GABRIEL (l'Abbé), *Le Christ et le Monde*, noticed, 192-195.

Germany, 260-278: state of the Church at the beginning of the century, 260; religious revival, and struggle for freedom from State control, 261-264; spread of religious orders, 264, 265; development of learning and science, 265, 266; emancipation of philosophy from Protestant ideas, 266, 267; meeting of the Catholic Unions at Frankfort, 268-272; congress of Catholic men of letters and science at Munich, 272-276; completion of the cathedral of Cologne; church-building in Germany, 276-278.

Gioberti (Vincenzo), his theological and philosophical errors, 61-77.

GONGORA, 95-127: estimate of Mr. Churton's work; his truthfulness, fairness, and comparative freedom from prejudice, 95-98; position occupied by Gongora, 99; his parentage, and education at the University of Salamanca, 99-101; residence at Cordova; character of his earlier poems, 101, 102; song of Lepanto, 102, 103; ode on the Armada, 103, 104; he enters the ecclesiastical state and assumes a courtier's life, 104, 105; visit of the English ambassador, 105-107; administration of the Duke of Lerma, 107-110; Gongora's literary influence; his song on a country life, 110; Barbary corsairs; Gongora's ballad, 111-113; street brawls, 113-116; religious revival in Spain: Capuchins, Carmelites, S. Teresa, 116-118; charitable institutions, 118, 119; Brother Francis of the Child Jesus, 119-121; the Inquisition, 121; Vision of S. Ildefonsus, 122; changes of ministry, 123; sonnet on court life, 124; visit

- of Prince Charles of England ; death of Gongora, 125 ; peculiarities of his style ; songs of fancy and affection ; ballads and burlesque poems, 126, 127 ; commendation of Mr. Churton's volumes, 127.
- Gounod (M.), *A Mass for Male Voices*, *noticed*, 512.
- Guerin (Eugenie de), article on, in *Christian Remembrancer*, 515, 516.
- Guizot (M.), part taken by, in regard to M. Coquerel, 550-552.
- Gury (F.) on table-turning, &c., 460.
- HAMILTON (Sir William), *Philosophical Lectures*, 179, 180 ; his doctrine of perception, 180-189.
- Handel, *Life of*, by V. Schœlcher, 128, 131, 132 ; his *Hallelujah* chorus, 132, 133 ; oratorios, 145.
- Hawker (Rev. R. S.), *The Quest of the Sangraal*, *reviewed*, 363, 374-376.
- History of the Holy Cross*, *noticed*, 497, 498.
- Holy Alliance, the, and European Arbitration*, from the "*Civiltà Cattolica*" of January 17, and December 5, 1863, 523-529.
- Home (D. D.), *Incidents in My Life*, 438-444, 450.
- Howson (Dr.), *Five Lectures on the Character of S. Paul*, *noticed*, 500-503.
- Hymns, vernacular, 157, 158, 235, 236.
- Howitt (W.), *History of the Supernatural in all Ages and Nations*, 456, 457.
- INGELOW (Jean), *Poems*, *reviewed*, 363, 382, 383.
- JOHN BULL, the, its honourable conduct on occasion of the Santiago catastrophe, 431, 432.
- John (S.) of the Cross, *Complete Works of*, vol. i. *noticed*, 499, 500.
- KINGSLEY (Rev. C.), his attack on Dr. Newman in *Macmillan's Magazine*, 518-522.
- What, then, does Dr. Newman mean ? *noticed*, 511.
- LAUREATE, THE, AND HIS SCHOOL, 363-385 : Tennyson the poet of the time, 363, 364 ; his mannerisms, 364-366 ; his artificial style, 366-368 ; nature and office of poetry, 368-370 ; Tennyson a genuine poet, 370, 371 ; disadvantages of his Protestantism, 371-374 ; the *Quest of the San Grail* a Catholic subject ; how handled by Mr. Hawker, 374-376 ; Tennyson's success in treating modern subjects, 377-379 ; single passages of great power, 379, 380 ; his speciality the beautiful, not the sublime, 380-382 ; his imitators, 382-385.
- Lerma, Duke of, his character and administration, 107-109.
- Lugo (Cardinal de), *Tractatus de Venerabili Eucharistiæ Sacramento*, 469, 471, 472.
- Luquet (Mgr.), *Vie et Vertus de l'Humble Servante de Dieu, la Vénérable Anna-Maria Taigi*, *noticed*, 492-494.
- MACMILLAN'S MAGAZINE, January, 1864, *noticed*, 517, &c.
- Maguire (J. F.), *Father Mathew : a Biography*, *reviewed*, 313-327.

- Magnan (l'Abbé), Histoire d'Urbain V. et de son Siècle, d'après les Manuscrits du Vatican, *noticed*, 489-492.
- Malines Congress, the, and *Modern Liberties*, from the "Civiltà Cattolica" of October 17, 1863, 242-247.
- Malines Congress, the, and modern music, 151, 152.
- Manning (Mgr.), Sermon on S. Thomas of Canterbury, *noticed*, 503, 504.
- Marguerite du Saint Sacrement, Vie de, par Louis de Cissey, *noticed*, 228-230.
- Marie-Eustelle, Vie et Esprit de, *noticed*, 230-232.
- Marie Lataste, la Vie et les Œuvres de, par l'Abbé P. Darbuis, *noticed*, 232, 233.
- Matter, nature of, in relation to the mystery of Transubstantiation, 475-478; popular conception, 478-480.
- Mesmerism; decisions of the Holy Roman Inquisition, 458-460.
- Montalembert (M. de), remarks of the "Civiltà Cattolica" on his speeches at the Malines Congress, 244-247.
- Moorish influence in the revival of learning overrated, 465, 466.
- Morison (J. C.), Life and Times of S. Bernard, *noticed*, 211-217.
- Munich Congress, the, of men of letters and science, 272-276, 552-554.
- MUSIC IN ITS RELIGIOUS USES, 128-158; its peculiar office in connection with religion, 128-130; the musical ear: its phenomena, 130-133; music a mysterious agency, 133, 134; its influence over the brute creation, 134, 135; its place in the Mosaic ritual, 135-139; its honourable mention in the Psalms, 139; notices of it in the New Testament, 140, 141; its use in the primitive Church, 141, 142; nature of the Tridentine reforms; Palestrina, 142-145; illustrative style of Church music, 145, 146; introduction of instruments, 146, 147; decisions of the Holy See; Benedict XIV., 147-151; reply to objections made at the Malines Congress, 151, 152; two ideas of the religious use of music; plain chant, its capacities and failures, 152-157; vernacular hymns, 157, 158.
- Naples and the Neapolitan States*, 250-255, 538-541: brigandage, 250-252; state of the prisons, 252-254, 540; visit of Victor Emmanuel, 254, 255; addresses to Francis II., 538, 539; an official carnival, 539; dissolution of the municipality of Naples, 540.
- Neckam (Alexandri), de Naturis Rerum, libri duo, edited by T. Wright, *noticed*, 494-496.
- Newman (Mr., now Very Rev.), Oxford University Sermons, 133, 134; his editorship of the "British Critic, and contributions thereto, 175-179; Dr. Howson's criticisms, 502, 503; attacked by Mr. Kingsley in Macmillan's Magazine, 517-522.
- OAKEYLEY (Canon), HISTORICAL NOTES ON THE TRACTARIAN MOVEMENT, Part III., 164-179: Margaret Chapel, its history, appearance, public services, and religious spirit, 164-169; anomaly of the position; relations with the Anglican authorities and the Tractarian leaders, 169-172; relations with foreign Catholics; visits to the Continent, 172-174;
- VOL. II.—NO. IV. [*New Series.*] 2 q

- devotional and ascetical publications, 175 ; the "British Critic" under Mr. Newman's editorship, 175-179.
- Ontologism at Rome*, from the "Revue Catholique de Louvain," of January, 1864, 529-532.
- OUR CONTEMPORARIES : object of this department in the REVIEW, 512-514.
- Ozanam (A. F.), *La Civilisation au Cinquième Siècle*, *noticed*, 222-224.
- PALESTRINA, Missa, "Æterna Christi Munera," 128, 151 ; the true history of his "Missa Papæ Marcelli," 143, 144.
- Pantheism, modern school of, 388-390.
- Papal brief on the Munich Congress, 553, 554.
- Peter (S.), his natural character, 87, 88.
- Philip II., representative of the national mind of Spain, 96, 97.
- Public Records, the, of Ireland and the DUBLIN REVIEW, *noticed*, 278.
- QUARTERLY REVIEW, January, 1864, *noticed*, 514.
- RENAN'S "VIE DE JESUS," 386-419 : the modern Pantheistic school, its attitude towards Christianity, 386-389 ; its mode of treating the received history of Christ, 390, 391 ; M. Renan's book a sort of apocryphal gospel, 391-394 ; nature of his alleged authorities, 394-397 ; his treatment of the Four Gospels, 398, 399 ; his theory as to S. Matthew, 399-401 ; S. Mark, 401-403 ; S. Luke, 404-406 ; S. John, 406-410 ; his contempt for learned criticism, 410-412 ; his theory of accommodation, 412-415 ; the book a failure as a mere work of art, 415-417 ; an insult, not a blow, to the Catholic faith, 417-419.
- Roberti (Giulio), a Mass for Four Voices, *noticed*, 512.
- Rome, 534-538 : address presented by Catholic laymen and the Pope's reply, 534, 535 ; revolutionary disturbances, 535 ; Roman prisons contrasted with Neapolitan, 536, 537 ; relations between French army and the Pontifical Government unsatisfactory, 537, 538.
- SALAMANCA, University of, 100, 101.
- SANTIAGO CATASTROPHE, THE, AND ITS CRITICS, 419-432 : hatred of the Blessed Virgin exhibited by free-thinkers and certain classes of Protestants, 419-420 ; this hatred especially elicited by the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, 421 ; the conflagration at Santiago, 421-423 ; conduct of the clergy, 423-426 ; comments and calumnies of the London anti-Catholic press, 426-431 ; the "John Bull" the single exception, 431, 432 ; religious view of the catastrophe, 432.
- Santiago : *La Verité de la Catastrophe*, 419, 424.
- Sardinia : persecutions against the Church, increased taxation, 541, 542.
- Saturday Review, the : spiteful comments on Father Faber, 159, 160 ; on the Santiago Catastrophe, 420, 426-431.
- Schachner (Herr), Oratorio, "Israel's Return from Babylon," *noticed*, 512.
- Schœlcher (V.), *Life of Handel*, 128, 131, 132.
- Schrader (Fr.), *De Unitate Romana Commentarius*, *noticed*, 482-486.
- SCIENCE AND THE MYSTERY OF THE BLESSED EUCHARIST, 464-480 : the

- importance of reconciling theology and science recognized in the Church from the earliest times, 464 ; intellectual activity of the 12th century, 465, 466 ; mediæval schools, 467 ; marvellous progress of physical science in the 17th century, 467, 468 ; the scientific relations of theology little studied during the last three centuries, 468-471 ; works of Cardinal de Lugo, Professor Ubaghs, and Father Dalgairns, 471, 472 ; importance of the present subject, 472, 473 ; the principles on which it should be examined, 473-475 ; the two terms to be reconciled : the nature of matter and the nature of the mystery of Transubstantiation, 475-478 ; popular conception of matter, 478-480.
- Shipley (Rev. O.), *Lyra Eucharistica* and *Lyra Messianica*, *noticed*, 504, 505.
- SLAVERY AND THE WAR IN AMERICA, 328-362 : M. Cochin's works and their translator, 328, 329 ; American antipathy to England ; its causes, 329-333 ; change of feeling in England respecting the war, 333, 334 ; slavery the real cause of secession, 334-336 ; Congress not a sovereign power, 336-338 ; the fears of the South excited by Mr. Lincoln's election, 338-341 ; foreign policy of the Union favourable to slavery, 341-343 ; humiliating concessions on the part of European governments, including the British, 343, 344 ; increasing strength of the anti-slavery party in the North, 345, 346 ; opposition to secession unexpected, 346-348 ; its object the re-opening of the slave trade, 348-351 ; and the extension of slavery, 351, 352 ; maintenance of the Union the one object of the war on the part of the North, 352-355 ; the abolition of slavery its probable result, 355-357 ; American slavery hateful in its character, and condemned by the Church, 357-362 ; restoration of the Union not desirable, 362.
- Smiles (Samuel), *Industrial Biography : Iron Workers and Tool Makers*, *noticed*, 509, 510.
- Smith (Dr. W.), *Dictionary of the Bible*, *noticed*, 203-209.
- Spectator, the, disgraceful remarks on the Santiago catastrophe, 424, 425, 431.
- Speid (Mrs. John B.), *Our Last Years in India*, 456, 457.
- Spicer (H.), *Strange Things among us*, 447, 448.
- SPIRITUALISM, 433-463 : import of the term, 433, 434 ; materialism and superstition, 435, 436 ; first American manifestations, the Rochester rappings, the Davenport boys, Koons' rooms, 436-438 ; Mr. Home's autobiography, 438 ; he becomes the subject of mysterious visitations, 439, 440 ; and extraordinary phenomena, 440-442 ; death-bed of his wife, 443, 444 ; his conduct to Fr. Ravignan, 444 ; accounts of *stances* in London and Paris, 444-449 ; character of the revelations, 449, 454 ; revival of magic and necromancy, 454-456 ; spiritualistic manifestations preternatural, 456-458 ; ecclesiastical decisions thereupon, 458-461 ; rules by which to test these manifestations, 461-463.
- States, the, of the Church and Piedmont*, 255-258 ; confiscation of the Pope's private property, 255, 256 ; expulsion of the Pontifical consuls, 256 ; pamphlet published by the Roman National Committee, 256, 257 ; persecutions of the clergy, 257, 541, 542.
- Story (W. W.), *Roba di Roma*, *reviewed*, 23, &c.

TAÏGI (V. Anna Maria), life of, by Mgr. Luquet, 492-494.

Tannhäuser, by Neville Temple and Edward Trevor, *reviewed*, 363, 382.

Tennyson (Alfred), Poems, The Princess, Idylls of the King, &c., *reviewed*, 363-385.

THEOLOGICAL ERRORS OF THE DAY—BROWNSON'S REVIEW, 58-95: Dr. Brownson's change of views, 58-60; his subjective orthodoxy and protestations of submission to the Church, 60, 61; his extravagant laudations of Gioberti, 61-67; injustice to the scholastics, 67-69; and unsteadiness of judgment, 69-71; meaning of the terms natural and supernatural, 71-73; a state of pure nature possible, 73, 74; the desire of the beatific vision no essential part of man's nature, 74-77; the argument for authority the great instrument of conversion, 77, 78; the first end of theology the benefit of the faithful, 78, 79; Frohschammer's theory that all the dogmas of faith belong to the province of reason, 79-84; and hence that science is independent of the authority of the Church, 84; Dr. Brownson's statement about the ideal Church, 85; his mistake as to the meaning of S. Vincent of Lerins, 85, 86; and as to S. Peter, 87; the natural character of that Apostle, 87, 88; Dr. Brownson's errors respecting the Papal authority and infallibility, 88-91; Fénelon's propositions, 91; and the dogmatic definitions of the Holy See, 92; his story of an Irish lady, 92-94; a parting word of advice, 94, 95.

Theologische Quartalschrift, September, 1863, *noticed*, 236, 237; January, 1864, 510, 511.

THEORIES OF SENSITIVE PERCEPTION, 179-189: Sir W. Hamilton's Philosophical Lectures, 179, 180; discrepancies between his views and those of Reid and Stewart, 180; especially as to his doctrine of Perception, 180, 181; the facts of perception accounted for on five different systems, 181-186; question as to which has the support of physiology, 186-188; conclusion, 188, 189.

Theodosia (S.), translation of her relics, 45-48.

TOURISTS AND SIGHT-SEERS IN ROME, 23-57: three classes of non-Catholic tourists, 23-25; Dr. Wordsworth's style unscholarlike, 25, 26; Mr. Story's graphic and lively, 26, 27; Mr. Burgon's vulgar, 27, 28; Mr. Story's descriptions of the Coliseum and the Stations of the Cross, 28-30; Dr. Wordsworth's notions on the relations of faith and charity, 30-33; and of faith and reason, 33-39; his assumptions and ignorance, 39-41; nature *versus* grace; Mr. Burgon, 41-43; Dr. Wordsworth, 43, 44; weakness of the latter's reasoning; the relics of S. Theodosia, 45-48; Mr. Burgon's argument against Transubstantiation compared with those of Claude and Aubertin, 48-53; Mr. Story's description of S. Peter's illuminated, 53, 54; his uncharitableness, 55; his description of a puppet-show applied to non-Catholic combatants, 56, 57.

Tractarians, former and later contrasted, 279-285. See Oakeley's "Historical Notes."

Transubstantiation, Mr. Burgon's arguments against, refuted, 48-53; nature of the mystery, 475-478.

UBAGHS (G. C.), *Du Dynamisme considéré en lui-même et dans ses rapports avec la Sainte Eucharistie*, 471, 472.

"UNION" MOVEMENT, the, 279-312: later phases of Anglicanism; fondness for ceremonial exhibition, and indifference to dogmatic truth, 279-285; character of the national mind, 285, 286; hopeful features in the High Church movement, 286, 287; the "Union" theory examined and discussed in the form of a dialogue, 287-295; characteristics of the movement; concession to the national spirit, and opposition to the principles of humility and submission, 295, 296; differences between Catholics and non-Catholics contrasted with differences among Catholics, 296-298; misrepresentations of a gossiping critic, 299-303; malevolent insinuations of a writer on the Life of Bishop Milner, 303-306; the theory of "union" undogmatic in principle and unchristian in spirit, 306-310; the equivocal character of the movement further demonstrated, 311, 312, 533.

Union Review, the, January, 1863—March, 1864, 279, 285, 287, 291, 296, 299-307, 311, 312, 533.

Urban V., Life of, by the Abbé Magnan, 489-492.

VAUGHAN (Father), *Fondation Catholique d'un Séminaire en Angleterre pour les Missions Etrangères*, *noticed*, 190, 191.

Vincent of Lerins (S.); the meaning of his celebrated saying, 86.

WISEMAN (Cardinal), *Religious and Social Position of Catholics in England*, *noticed*, 481, 482.

——— *Preface to the Complete Works of S. John of the Cross*, *noticed*, 499, 500.

Word-painting, its origin and defects, 364, 366, 367.

Wordsworth (Dr.), *Journal of a Tour in Italy, with Reflections on the Present Condition and Prospects of Religion in that Country*, *reviewed*, 23, &c.



